DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 133 80 EA 005 876

AUTHOR Moffatt, Linda Clare
TITLE State Policy Making for the Public Schools of Colorado.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Educational Governance Project.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 74
GRANT OEG-0-73-0499
NOTE 80p.; Related documents are EA 005 798-799, EA 005 833-834, and EA 005 875

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Accountability; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Elementary Education; *Financial Policy; *Policy Formation; Political Attitudes; *Political Influences; School Integration; Secondary Education; State Departments of Education; *State Government; State Legislation; Teacher Associations
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title V; ESEA Title V

ABSTRACT

While Colorado politics is in a state of flux, education has consistently maintained a position of prime importance and concern in the State. Public elementary and second education in Colorado is the most expensive governmental service provided by State and local government. This report examines Colorado's socioeconomic and political conditions and focuses in particular on organizations, governmental agencies, and persons affecting educational policymaking. The author looks first at the structure for education policymaking in the State. This structure includes the Colorado General Assembly, the Governor, and the State Education Agency. In the next section, she discusses the issues facing policymakers. Such issues as school finance, educational accountability, and school desegregation are discussed. The author then looks at the policymaking roles assumed by such participants as educational interest groups, the State education agency, the Governor, and the State legislature. A final section discusses the importance in policymaking of the Council on Educational Development, a coalition of 16 education and noneducation interest groups. (JF)

ED 087133

STATE POLICY MAKING FOR THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF COLORADO

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Linda Clare Moffatt

Prepared for
The Educational Governance Project
The Ohio State University
29 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

EA 005 876

This report is one of twelve case studies growing out of the Educational Governance Project. In addition, two major reports, a comparative analysis across states and an explication of alternative models of state governance of education, are in preparation. The Governance Project began in January, 1972 and is to be completed in August, 1974. The work was funded by the U. S. Office of Education under Title V (Section 505) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (OEG-0-73-0499). The Policy Board for the Project was composed of three chief state school officers: Martin W. Essex of Ohio, Jack P. Nix of Georgia, and Ewald B. Nyquist of New York, with the State of Ohio serving as fiscal agent. An Advisory Committee composed of eleven persons concerned with general and educational governance also served the project. Contract for the work was let to the College of Education, The Ohio State University and Roald F. Campbell and Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr. were the directors.

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

February, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I - Introduction 1

Socioeconomic Conditions 1
Political Culture 3

Section II - Structure for Education Policy Making 7

The Colorado General Assembly 7
The Governor 11
The State Education Agency 12

Section III - Educational Issues 18

School Finance 19
Educational Accountability 30
School Desegregation 40

Section IV - The State Educational Policy-Making Process 47

The Role of Educational Interest Groups 47
The Role of the State Education Agency 54
The Role of the Governor 62
The Role of the State Legislature 65

Section V - Summary and Interpretation 69

Footnotes 74

INTRODUCTION

In many respects Colorado is a state of stark contrasts. It offers magnificent mountains, lush farmland, and, at the same time, arid desert. One area of the state can barely contain its population density and growth, while other areas are slowly depopulating. Tourism is an important state industry and sports are a native pastime, however, voters vetoed the 1976 Denver Olympics. While Colorado is a Democratic state by registration, the popular governor for the past eleven years was a Republican

As we examine the educational policy-making process in Colorado, many more interesting contrasts will come to light. As they do, they will reveal a very special state with a uniqueness and character all its own.

Socioeconomic Conditions

Colorado, one of the eight "mountain states," has a total population of 2,207,259. Of this total, fully eighty per cent live along the eastern front of the Rockies. The eastern front stretches from Fort Collins in the north, through Denver, and then on down to Pueblo. While this area of the state finds the continually expanding population to be a serious problem, the eastern plains, west, and south are slowly decreasing in population.

The main hub of the densely populated eastern front is the "mile high city," and capitol of Colorado, Denver. In 1970 the population of Denver and the surrounding four county metropolitan area was 1,227,529. Of this total, 12 per cent were Spanish-American and 9.9 per cent were black. While the city of Denver itself has increased in population very little over the past two decades, the four surrounding counties have incurred an amazing population increase of two to three hundred per cent! Part of the reason for this population expansion has been due to the fact that Denver has become "the nation's most important scientific-technical center between

Boston and California."[1] Most of the light scientific and electronic industries in the Denver area (and along the front range) are government related.

Denver's growing population has caused a host of socioeconomic problems for the city. In 1969 the Denver Chamber of Commerce:

> "....acknowledged that there was a pressing need for 15,000 low-income housing units to stem urban blight by 1975, an expenditure of $100 million for school construction by 1989, and huge outlays for effective flood control and storm drainage facilities to protect the city from the ravaging effect of flash floods in the wake of periodic torrential downpours."[2]

Another section of Colorado with serious problems, although of a different variety from Denver's, is southern Colorado. This area, heavily populated with Spanish Americans, suffers with high rates of unemployment, illiteracy, infant deaths, and other deficiencies reflected in draft rejections. The declining soft coal industry plus the advent of automation at the Pueblo steel mill (the only one in Colorado) have been responsible in part for many of southern Colorado's problems as well as for its declining population. At present, the principal source of income in the south is agriculture.

Agriculture is also an important economic activity in the eastern plains. Since the rainfall is sparce and the climate is arid, dry farming is frequently practiced. In recent years the acreage placed under irrigation has increased with the water supplied from deep wells.

Looking from the east to the west, the majestic vista of the Rocky Mountains along the Continental Divide comes into view:

> This is the land of summer snow banks in high ranges, of mountain plateaus and icy Alpine lakes, of small emerald valleys with cascading streams where early autumns turn the delicate aspen to bright gold, of stands of pine and spruce, of passes 12,000 feet above the sea.[3]

Tourism is the mainstay of the west, with such attractions offered as the Rocky Mountain National Park and booming ski towns such as Aspen and Vail. With the increasing popularity of skiing in the United States, Colorado

has invested more than forty million dollars in lifts and mountain facilities for the sport. Along with tourism, large sheep and cattle ranches and mining bring in additional income to western Colorado. With a population of 20,170, Grand Junction is the largest town in western Colorado.

While tourism is important to the Colorado economy, manufacturing is the chief economic activity, grossing more than 1.7 billion dollars per year (1970 figure). In 1969 the median family income was $9,555, slightly below the national average of $9,590 for that year. During the same year nine per cent of the families in Colorado had an income of less than poverty level.

Political Culture

Colorado's political character can be described as clean, moderate, and unpredictable. At the statehouse many legislators look first to a man's feet, because, according to western tradition, wearing cowboy boots signifies honesty and lends credibility to the wearer. Political patronage and "buying" legislative votes by lobbyists are virtually non-existent in Colorado politics. Along with what appears to be ingrained respect for honesty comes a strong tendency to maintain a conservative, sometimes moderate, posture. Historically, the philosophy of many of the state's most successful politicians "has been to worry about special state and district needs first and let the ideological issues come second."[4] At the same time, the voters in Colorado have never been a predictable lot. An example of this unpredictability was evidenced by the voters in the 1972 elections. While Richard Nixon carried the state by 63 per cent, its congressional delegation was split with the election of four Republicans and three Democrats. Also, in the same election, voters astounded the nation by turning thumbs down to state funding of the Olympics, thus circumventing the plan to hold the games in Denver in 1976.

Through the years, Colorado has maintained the image of a highly competitive, two-party state. By registration the state is Democratic, but, actually, there are only 70,000 more Democrats than Republicans. Colorado also appears to be a "swing" state as it cannot really be labeled as belonging to either political party, and in recent decades it has swung from one party to the other.[5] As was shown by the 1972 elections, the "coattail" effect is not very strong in Colorado politics.

In Colorado, as in many other states, the Republican party finds its strength in the rural and suburban areas. On the other hand, Democratic strength is found in the urban areas. Recent population trends have benefited the Republicans as the suburbs, especially around Denver, have increased in population, while the cities have had minimal growth in population. The Republican party has also benefited with the recent inception of Hispano political parties, such as "La Raza Unida," which are competing with the Democratic party.

In recent years the Republican party has maintained control of state politics. Since 1962, except for the House in 1965-66, Republicans have controlled both chambers of the legislature. The present legislature is dominated by older, conservative, suburban senators and by younger, more progressive, suburban representatives. In 1962 John Love, a Republican, defeated the incumbent Democratic governor, Stephen L. R. McNichols. Governor Love was reelected in 1966 and, again, in 1970.

John Love has been described as not the type of leader who forges ahead on a white charger; but, rather, as a governor who conscientiously attempts to secure the mood and wishes of the people and then, act accordingly. He has, however, taken a surprisingly aggressive stand at times. One such instance occurred in 1967 when he signed a bill giving Colorado the most liberal abortion law in the nation at that time.

While Colorado politics is in a state of flux, education has consistently maintained a position of prime importance and concern in the state. Public elementary and secondary education in Colorado is the most expensive governmental service provided by state and local government.[6] Also, Colorado is a leader in terms of number of years of education completed by the population as well as in per capita expenditures for education.[7]

Historically, Colorado has placed strong emphasis upon the importance of maintaining local control of education:

> Except for widely scattered Spanish and Mexican settlements in the southern part, the first permanent settlers of Colorado were miners...Among these people, rugged individualism and self-reliance were highly valued characteristics. As a consequence, education was for many years viewed as primarily a local concern. Although this point of view prevailed in all states in their early history, it received exaggerated emphasis in Colorado.[8]

The concept of local control has endured and even today plays an important part in education politics.

While Colorado legislators have been concerned with local control, they have also shown a great interest in holding the education community accountable for the expenditure of public funds. Because of this concern, the state legislature has increasingly played an important role in the educational policy-making process in recent years. Examples of this involvement occurred in 1970 when the legislature established procedures for appropriating federal as well as state education dollars; and in 1971 when the legislature passed three pieces of pacesetting accountability legislation.

The active role of the Colorado legislature in education was accompanied by "poor communication and even hostility" with the state education agency.[9] There are indications now, however, that this relationship has slowly improved over the past few years.

In addition to the state legislature and state education agency, a number of private organizations are vital to Colorado's education politics. Prior

to 1969 school finance reform had been consistently stifled by strong non-education organizations. However, in 1967 sixteen education and non-education organizations united to form the Council on Education Development (COED). This coalition has played an important part in the educational policy-making process since its inception, especially in the area of school finance, as will be shown later.

School finance, in 1973, finally spurred the Governor to enter the arena of educational politics in an active way. In January the Governor came out with his own proposal for school support aimed toward better equalization of property tax efforts among school districts. The Governor's proposal would have allocated state funds amounting to about $309 million to schools through an equalization program in 1974.

With increasing sums of money being put into education, the involvement of more and more people into the policy-making process, and the fact that many people, especially children, have so much at stake in the state's education system, it seems imperative that an attempt be made to understand the educational policy-making process in Colorado. This introduction sets the stage for such an analysis. The following sections will deal with the process by which education policy in Colorado is made.

STRUCTURE FOR STATE EDUCATION POLICY MAKING

In order to understand the educational policy-making process in a state, one needs a general understanding of the structure of the state's government including the state's education agency. This section will attempt to highlight those structural features of the legislative and executive branches of state government most relevant to educational policy making in Colorado.

The Colorado General Assembly

The one hundred member Colorado General Assembly convenes annually in the old Statehouse in Denver. In the 1973 Republican dominated legislature, there were twenty-two Republicans and thirteen Democrats in the Senate, and thirty-seven Republicans and twenty-eight Democrats in the House. While the General Assembly holds annual sessions, even year sessions are considered "short sessions" with only those items appearing on the Governor's call being permitted to come up before the legislative body.

The Citizens' Conference on State Legislatures conducted a study of fifty state legislatures during the latter half of 1969 and early 1970. After a thorough investigation, designed to reveal legislative effectiveness as measured by functionality, accountability, informedness, independence, and representativeness, the Conference ranked Colorado twenty-eighth among the states.[10] During a meeting in Denver, the executive director of the study stated that the five "most fundamental problems" of the Colorado Legislature were:

1. Not enough space for members, staff, and committees
2. Inadequate compensation for legislators
3. Too many committees
4. Insufficient hearing notices on sending legislation to those affected
5. Inadequate regulation of conflicts of interest on the part of legislators and of lobbyists[11]

More problems will become evident as we continue to examine the Colorado General Assembly.

Let us look at the Colorado legislature in terms of the structural placement of power regarding both leadership positions and committees. While the Speaker of the House is selected by caucus, the presiding officer of the Senate is the Lieutenant Governor. With this inability of the Senate to elect its own leader, a continual power play takes place among the Lieutenant Governor, the president pro tem, and the majority leader. In the words of one senator, "Each is jealous of his power and it results in conflicts and lost time."[12]

Power conflicts exist also among the standing committees because the published rules do not adequately describe the jurisdictions of committees. The most notable result of this lack of rules has resulted in the creation of the powerful "watchdog of the Senate," the Joint Budget Committee. This committee, consisting of three senators and three representatives, virtually controls all legislation dealing with appropriations.

Power has also been placed in the hands of committee chairmen and in the rules committees, primarily because of the fact that the Colorado Legislature does not require that bills favorably reported on by a committee be taken up on the floor. Thus, they have committee chairmen controlling legislation with their "pocket veto," and the rules committee (especially in the House) halting legislation coming out of standing committees with an intervening veto.

While the overall functioning of the General Assembly appears to be hampered by these power conflicts, the individual legislators themselves have a number of problems to cope with. The first of these involves the large (twenty-nine) number of standing committees. This situation has resulted in 26 per cent of the House membership having more than three committee assignments, and in 100 per cent of the Senate membership having more than four committee assignments. When these heavy loads are combined with the fact

that these legislators have no offices, limited secretarial help, and limited staff resources, one can understand why the Citizens' Conference has termed the number of standing committees a "fundamental problem."

At the time of the Citizens' Conference study, private meetings were permitted in the General Assembly. However, this was changed in November of 1972 when the "Sunshine Law" was passed (i.e. a law initiated by a vote of the people). This law called for public disclosures of elected officials, judges, and lobbyists of private financial interests; and also, for all official state meetings to be open to the public.

Let us take a closer look at those standing committees which deal most closely with education. The House and Senate education committees formally initiate education legislation. It is important to note, however, that a great many bills related to education are introduced by individual legislators who are not members of the standing committees on education. The 1973 Senate education committee had eleven members (7 Republicans, 4 Democrats), while the House education committee had fourteen members (8 Republicans and 6 Democrats). Another committee, the Joint Budget Committee, dealt with all of the education legislation involving appropriations.

Besides the regular standing committees, the General Assembly also supports a body of interim committees. These committees, designed to work on long range problems or "sticky questions" the legislature will later be working on, meet six to ten times during the period when the Assembly is not in regular session. Interim committee members are appointed by the legislators in the Legislative Council, and usually, but not always, are members of comparable standing committees. So far, these committees have been given much freedom to study what they want to, however, there are indications that the General Assembly and the Legislative Council will tighten their reins in the future. For instance, in 1972 the interim committee on public education

was asked by the legislature to study PPBS and school discipline. The work of the interim committees often results in proposed legislation.

The Legislative Council was created in 1953 and serves as the fact finding and information collecting agency of the Colorado General Assembly. The Council consists of fourteen members: the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House (ex officio members), and twelve appointed members, six senators and six representatives. While the Council creates the interim committees, the committees function for the most part on their own. As one legislative staff person remarked, "The function of the Council is a bookkeeping, progress report thing rather than (to place) substantive input into the committees."[13]

The Legislative Council also appoints a Director of Research, who may in turn appoint other professional researchers and clerical staff. At present, the staff of the Council consists of eighteen persons, nine of whom are professionals. Among the primary duties of this staff are: 1) spot research for individual legislators, 2) research for the interim committees, and 3) research and administrative assistance to the standing committees. Most of the standing committees, including the education committees, have one of the Legislative Council researchers assigned to them during the session. The only other staff member individual legislators may possibly have available to them would be a legislative intern from a Colorado university or college. The only legislative standing committee which maintains its own, separate research staff is the Joint Budget Committee, with a staff of seven. This staff is also made available to the appropriations committees.

It seems fair to mention at this point that Colorado legislators seem to be responding to some of their problems in a positive way. A committee on legislative procedures worked in 1972 on a resolution calling for a state constitutional amendment to streamline the state legislature (it failed).

In November of 1972 this committee was working on drafts of legislation to tighten regulations pertaining to lobbyists. While interest groups such as Common Cause and the Citizen's Conference on the Colorado Legislature may push to bring some of the problems of the Colorado General Assembly out in the open and may even propose constitutional amendments, it appears that the major responsibility for change must come from within the lawmaking body itself.

The Governor

We turn now from the legislative to the executive branch of government and to the formal powers of the Governor in Colorado. On Schlessinger's index of the formal powers of the Governor, the Governor in Colorado was given a rating of fifteen points on a scale ranging from seven to twenty.[14] Concerning the Governor's tenure potential, he was given a very high rating. The Colorado Governor has a four year term (he runs on a joint ballot with the candidate for Lieutenant Governor) with no restraint on re-election. Also rated very strong was the Governor's veto power; at least a 3/5 majority vote of the legislature is needed to override a veto. In the area of budgetary and appointive powers, however, the Governor of Colorado has less formal power than governors in a majority of states. Rather than follow the executive budget procedures of most states, the Governor and his staff annually present a budget proposal to be considered by members of the General Assembly. As one legislative leader put it, "Colorado's budgetary system is archaic." Regarding the appointive powers of the Governor, the Governor in Colorado ranks in the lower fifth of the states on the Schlessinger index.[15] The rankings of Colorado with other selected states on the Schlessinger Index is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

A COMBINED INDEX OF THE FORMAL POWERS OF THE GOVERNOR IN SELECTED STATES

Rank Among States	State	Tenure Potential	Appointive Powers	Budget Powers	Veto Power	Total Index
1	New York	5	5	3	5	20
13	Massachusetts	5	5	5	3	18
23	Nebraska	4	3	4	5	16
29	Colorado	5	1	4	5	15
47	Florida	3	2	1	3	9
50	Texas	2	1	1	3	7

SOURCE: Joseph A. Schlessinger. See footnote 14.

The Colorado Governor has a personal staff of two professionals and a budget office with twenty-two people. While the Governor does not maintain a specific advisor on education, one member of his personal staff does devote a good deal of time to education. Also, several staff members in his budget office spend part of their time working in the area of school finance.

Also included in the executive branch of government in Colorado is the state education agency, to which we now turn.

The State Education Agency

The Colorado Constitution, adopted in 1876, provided for a system of public schools in the following language:

> The General Assembly shall, as soon as practicable, provide for establishment and maintenance of a uniform system of free public schools throughout the state wherein all residents of the state between the ages of six and twenty-one may be educated gratuitously.[16]

The legislature, on the basis of this provision, provided for a superintendent of public education who was, prior to 1950, elected by popular vote. In 1948 the Colorado Constitution was amended to provide for a State Board of Education and transferred general supervision of the public schools from the Superintendent of Public Education to the State Board of Education as noted below:

> The general supervision of the public schools of the state shall be vested in a board of education whose powers and duties shall be as now or hereafter prescribed by law. Said board shall consist of one member from each congressional district of the state, and, if the total number of such congressional districts be an even number, one additional member...[17]

With only five members, the Colorado State Board of Education is the smallest among the states. At present, the board consists of five Republicans. There is one woman on the board, no minority group is represented, and there are no ex officio members. State board members in Colorado are nominated and elected on a partisan ballot, one of eight states using this method.[18] Congressional districts are used for the nomination and election of state board members. Members serve for overlapping terms of six years, and vacancies if they occur, are filled by the board with the appointee serving until the next general election. A chairman and vice-chairman are elected by the members of the board for two year terms. Board meetings are held monthly and special meetings may be held when deemed necessary. The members of the board receive no compensation, however, they are reimbursed for expenses.

As outlined in the Colorado School Laws 1971, the primary duties of the State Board of Education are as follows:

1. To exercise general supervision over the public schools of the state and the educational programs maintained and operated by all state governmental agencies for persons who shall not have completed the twelfth grade level of instruction.

2. To appoint a commissioner of education.

3. To appraise the public schools and submit recommendations to the Governor and General Assembly for improvements in education.

4. To approve the annual budget request for the department prior to submission.

5. To order the distribution and apportionment of federal and state monies granted and appropriated to the department for the use of the public schools of the state, except monies granted or made available to another agency specifically designated.[19]

Referring to the second of the primary duties ("to appoint a commissioner of education"), the State Board appoints the commissioner as its official secretary. This method of selection for a chief state school officer is used in twenty-six states.[20] According to the Constitution of Colorado, "The qualifications, tenure, compensation, powers, and duties of said commissioner shall be as prescribed by law, subject to the supervision of said board."[21]

Aside from the State Board of Education, Colorado has an independent State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education which was created in 1967. This state board consists of nine members representing various segments of the population (i.e. agriculture, business, etc.) who are appointed by the governor to six year overlapping terms. The State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education exercises all powers and performs all duties (formerly vested in the State Board of Education) with respect to community and technical colleges within the state system. Also, there is a Commission on Higher Education which is the statutory and coordinating agency primarily concerned with the higher education system in Colorado. These two bodies obviously perform functions which in some states are performed by the State Board of Education.

The primary functions of the Colorado Commissioner of Education are to be the advisory and executive officer of the State Board of Education and to be the chief administrator of the department of education. He is also to serve as the state librarian. As advisor to the State Board of Education, he is charged with supplying to them required information, preparing a budget for the State Department of Education, organizing and directing the personnel within the department, and with making certain that all of the policies, rules, and regulations adopted by the State Board of Education are properly executed.

Regarding the Commissioner's formal relationship with other governmental agencies, the Commissioner is given some other specified duties. The Colorado School Laws state that the chief state school officer must "...prepare for the board to transmit annually...a report accounting to the Governor and the General Assembly for the efficient discharge of all responsibilities assigned by law or directive to the department."[22] Also, the Commissioner is required "To submit to the Governor and the General Assembly...a consolidated report of the receipts and expenditures of each school district in the state for the regular school year...He shall also submit a consolidated report by school district showing dropout rates, teacher-pupil ratios, number of courses offered, teacher turnover rates, reading and achievement levels, and such other statistics as may be required by the State Board of Education to reflect the quality of education offered by each district."[23]

The Commissioner is appointed on a day to day basis and is not subject to any civil service regulations. The present State Board of Education appears to have used a comprehensive selection procedure for selecting a Commissioner consisting of extensive advertisement with open applications, the utilization of a five member screening committee, and the solicitation of recommendations from all of the education interest groups.

The State Education Agency consists of 1) the State Board of Education, 2) the office of the Commissioner of Education, 3) a Department of Education consisting of such divisions, boards, agencies, officers, and employees as are or may be provided by law or by order of the board and the commissioner, and 4) the state library.

Compared to many other states, the total number of professional staff personnel in the Colorado Department of Education is small. In the office headquarters in Denver, the Colorado Department of Education had ninety-four full-time professionals (1972 figure) and the department had no full-time

professionals in regional offices. In May of 1973 the Department announced a reduction of staff because of potential cuts of $2 million in the allocation of federal funds for education to Colorado.[24] Among those terminated were a total of thirty-six of the Department's professional staff.

While many state departments of education appear to be hampered by stringent civil service requirements, Colorado is in the unique position of being almost completely free of this constraint. The Commissioner and Assistant Commissioners of Education and all other positions classified as director, consultant, supervisor, or instructor are "...declared to be educational in nature and not under the classified civil service of the state."[25] This law, by giving the Commissioner relatively free rein in the employment of Department personnel, affords him the opportunity to build his own management team if he so desires.

One of the duties ascribed to the Commissioner is "...to establish and maintain adequate statistical and financial records of school districts, and to maintain a continuous research program to stimulate improvements in education."[26] Following this directive, the Colorado Department of Education maintains an Office of Planning and Evaluation. This office, directed by an Assistant Commissioner, contains four units. The Assessment and Evaluation Unit has one director and four consultants. The Field Services Unit maintains a staff of four persons. The Legal Services Unit has a director, its only staff. And, finally, the Planning Unit has two co-directors and four consultants.

In fiscal year 1973 the legislature appropriated a total of $2,921,890 for support of the State Department of Education itself.[27] However, this was less than half of the budget of the Department. About 58 per cent (1969 figure) of the Department's operational budget came from federal funds.[28] About one third of the federal funds were secured from Title V funds alone.[29]

In summary, the Colorado General Assembly, the State Education Agency, and, to some extent, the Governor, all appear to lack an adequate number of staff. In addition, the legislature also suffers a severe shortage of office space for legislators. It would seem likely that these structural conditions probably hamper the policy-making capabilities of the agencies involved. For instance, the lack of adequate staff forces legislators to rely heavily on outside groups such as educational interest groups and the State Department of Education as sources of information. At the same time, its limited number of professional positions make it difficult for the Department of Education to provide the quality and quantity of information needed by legislators and others to make complex education decisions.

We have also seen that Colorado's State Constitution establishes a five member State Board of Education with members to be elected on partisan ballots; and that the Board is given the authority to appoint the Commissioner of Education. It will become apparent in the final sections of this study that these structural arrangements play a crucial role in the relationships established by Colorado's State Education Agency with the General Assembly and the Governor.

EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

The Governance Project has examined the process of educational policy making through four issue areas across twelve states. These issue areas are: 1) school finance, 2) school desegregation, 3) certification, and 4) a program improvement area. In some states there has been recent and often extensive activity in each of these issue areas thus providing ready access to an understanding of the states' process of educational policy making. This is not entirely the case in Colorado.

Certification has not been an active policy issue area in the state for many years. While there were some indications that the Committee on Public Education was interested in selecting performance based certification as a study topic, this had not been determined at the time of our study. Because of relative inactivity at the state level in the area of certification, this issue will not be included in the study of Colorado. One reason for Colorado's lack of interest in certification could have been due to the fact that policy actors have devoted a great amount of time and energy to school finance and accountability measures during the past few years. Perhaps, with the passage of the 1973 School Finance Act, certification will emerge as an important state issue area for Colorado in the near future.

Recent court cases as well as a new awareness of the need to provide equal educational opportunity to every child have forced the nation to realize that many problems exist within the area of school finance. Colorado proved to be no exception and was recently involved in both school finance reform and an attempt to make educators and the state education agency more accountable for the vast sums of state monies invested in education. We shall discuss in turn the issue areas of school finance, accountability, and school desegregation.

School Finance

In Colorado, as in every state, two major dimensions of the state school finance program are: 1) raising revenues, and 2) allocating revenues. Several observations will be made concerning these dimensions before beginning a discussion directed more specifically toward the policy-making process as it relates to Colorado's school finance legislation.

When looking at revenue raising in a state, information concerning the "ability" of the state to support elementary and secondary education as compared to the "effort" made by the citizens to support public education is revealing. In terms of Colorado's "ability," as measured by personal income per child, the state ranks 19th among the states. However, the personal income per child in 1970 was $14,753, which placed Colorado below the United States average of $15,063.[30] On the other hand, Colorado's "effort" to support the public schools places it 16th among the states and above the United States average. Colorado's "effort," as measured by local and state revenues for the public schools as a per cent of personal income (1970), is 5.6 per cent. This figure exceeds the United States average, which is 5.0 per cent. Alaska provides the most "effort" among the states with 7.7 per cent and Alabama provides the least "effort" with 3.8 per cent.[31] We can conclude from these figures that Colorado is on fairly even keel when comparing the state's "ability" to its "effort." In fact, the state ranks a bit higher in effort than does in ability, as noted in Table 2.

Another part of the dimension of revenue raising is the relative financial contribution made by state, local, and federal governments. In 1972-73 the estimated per cent of revenue for public elementary and secondary education from the state government was 28 per cent.[32] This contrasts to the contribution from local government which was 64.3 per cent.[33] The per cent of revenue for public education from the federal government was 7.7 per cent

which was also the United States' average.[34] Comparative data are shown in Table 3. From these data we can conclude that the major burden for support of public schools in Colorado (up to 1973) fell upon the local government.

TABLE 2

MEASURES OF ABILITY AND EFFORT OF COLORADO AND SELECTED STATES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE, 1970

States	Ability		Effort	
	Rank Among States	Personal Income Per Child	Rank Among States	Local State Revenue For Schools as Per Cent of Personal Income
Alabama	47	$10,220	48	3.8
Alaska	15	15,217	1	7.7
California	6	17,694	35	4.5
Colorado	19	14,753	16	5.6
Massachusetts	4	18,246	32	4.6
Minnesota	25	14,073	3	6.3
Texas	33	12,670	23	5.2

SOURCE: See footnotes 30 and 31.

TABLE 3

RELATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS OF STATE, LOCAL, AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENTS TO REVENUES FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN SELECTED STATES, 1972-73

States	Rank From State	Per Cent From State	Rank From Local	Per Cent From Local	Rank From Federal	Per Cent From Federal
Alabama	5	63.6	47	18.9	3	17.6
Alaska	2	72.4	49	11.7	5	15.9
California	31	36.7	19	56.5	33	6.8
Colorado	41	28.0	11	64.3	29	7.7
Massachusetts	45	24.2	6	70.7	41	5.2
Minnesota	10	55.0	35	40.5	44	4.5
Texas	22	46.3	32	43.0	17	10.7

SOURCE: See footnotes 32-34.

Sources of state revenues form the basis for a final observation about revenue raising in Colorado. Colorado's major sources of state revenue for all purposes in 1971 were: 1) federal aid grants, $303,000,000; 2) sales (and use), liquor, and cigarette taxes, $182,000,000; 3) income taxes, $173,000,000; and 4) highway taxes, $105,000,000. The total state revenue in 1971 was $968,000,000. During the thirties, sales, income, and liquor

taxes were introduced in Colorado. Since that time, voters have approved a pari-mutual tax, an income tax on oil production, a cigarette tax, and a motor fuel tax. Over the years the income and sales taxes have been raised by the voters, and in 1966 the property tax was eliminated as a source of revenue for state government.[35]

Although there have been no major changes in Colorado's tax structure during the past decade, the state's economy has grown and flourished. The increasing revenues from an expanded economy have provided for the expansion and improvement of state services. For example, the operating budget for higher education increased from $32 million in 1962 to $115.3 million in 1972.[36] Colorado entered the 1972 fiscal year with a $51.8 million surplus and ended the year with a surplus of $121.6 million. In Governor Love's 1973 State of the State Message he recommended that the legislature use this surplus of funds to provide property tax relief in the form of a new school finance formula rather than changing the tax structure.[37]

The second dimension of the state school finance program is the allocation of revenues. Colorado's expenditures for public schools as measured by the public school revenue receipts per pupil in average daily attendance in 1971-72 were $1,092 which was just below the United States' average of $1,094.[38]

An important factor relating to the allocation of revenues is the type of school finance formula employed in the state. Colorado's Public School Foundation Act of 1969 utilized the Strayer-Haig-Mort formula. The HEW publication Public School Finance Programs 1971-72 included in it a brief explanation of this type of formula:

> Educational needs are calculated in terms of a uniform amount per pupil or per teacher or some other method that ignores the variation of educational needs of the student population; and the yield of a required local tax effort in proportion to ability is deducted from the total cost of the program in order to determine the state's allocation.[39]

The 1969 Foundation Act set the foundation level (the district share per ADAE plus the state share per ADAE) at $440 per pupil in average daily attendance. By 1973 this level was raised to $518, however, the operating expenses per student that year averaged about $950 state wide.[40] In 1973 the state's share of the foundation program averaged $310 per ADAE.[41]

Colorado school districts differ widely in their ability to provide revenues. For instance, while the average revenue raised by a one mill levy in 1972 was $10.38 per ADAE, the amount a one mill levy raised in Lake City was $79.87 per ADAE. On the lower end of the scale, Fountain, Colorado was only able to raise $2.17 with one mill levy per ADAE. While the total budgeted expenditures per ADAE in 1972 for Fountain was $883.04, it was $2,858.31 for Lake City. Lake City needed to levy only 16.36 mills to raise the larger amount, but Fountain had to levy 40.01 mills in order to raise a much smaller amount of money.[42]

In summary, these background data indicate some problems with Colorado's 1969 Public School Foundation Act. First, the foundation level was significantly less than the amount required to finance the education program in any district. Second, significant differences in ability to raise revenue existed among the districts, particularly when they exceeded the minimum foundation level. Third, the fact that local government carried most of the burden for financing public education placed a heavy strain upon the property tax system. Since the property tax base is relatively "inelastic," the tax rate had to be increased frequently in order to meet expanding education costs. The property tax was the primary source of school financing, but, at the same time it was the tax base which grew the least. Finally, the old foundation law made the support for the education of the children in the state a direct function of the property tax capacity of the local school districts. With these basic conditions in mind, let us turn to a brief

examination of the effort to change the school finance program in Colorado. Particular attention will be placed on the process which brought about school finance reform in 1973.

While state funding of public schools began in Colorado in 1935, through the years the state's participation in a school finance program remained limited. By 1968 the state equalization program assured approximately $281 per pupil for each school district. Prior to this time the various educational agencies began to exert a major effort to increase the state's share in the financing of public education. However, as various ideas were introduced to the legislature, a major block (usually consisting of powerful non-education interest groups) would form and manage to stop the proposed legislation.

In an attempt to foster some constructive action in the school finance area, the Council on Educational Development (COED) was formed in 1967. This coalition was composed of sixteen groups, including the major education organizations as well as important organizations from such areas as industry and agriculture. The present membership of the Council on Education Development is as follows:

1. Colorado Association of School Boards
2. Colorado Cattlemen's Association
3. Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry
4. Colorado Education Association
5. Colorado State Department of Education
6. Colorado Association of School Executives
7. Colorado Woolgrowers
8. Colorado Grange
9. Colorado Cattle Feeders
10. Colorado Federation of Teachers
11. Farmers' Union
12. Colorado Farm Bureau
13. State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education
14. Colorado Parent Teachers Association

As a result of this unification of formerly conflicting groups, COED worked closely with the interim Legislative Committee on Fiscal Policy and

in 1969 was instrumental in the formulation and passage of the Public School Foundation Act (Senate Bill 127). This new piece of legislation provided a minimum foundation of $440 per pupil per average daily attendance entitlement. This represented an 80 per cent increase in the previous base level of support. The $440 was guaranteed primarily from three sources: 1) a property tax not to exceed 17 mills in each district; 2) specific ownership taxes in each district (such as a tax on mobile homes); and 3) the state general fund contribution as appropriated by the General Assembly.

Each of the one hundred and eighty-one school districts was required to levy seventeen mills, unless that rate provided more than $250 for each pupil per ADAE. Where this occurred the foundation levy was changed as follows:

1. For a district in which a 17 mill levy will raise less than $250 per pupil (ADAE), the foundation levy is 17 mills.
2. For a district in which a 17 mill levy will raise more than $250 per pupil (ADAE), $250 must be provided unless that amount is raised with a levy of less than 14 mills.
3. If a levy of 14 mills will raise more than $250 (ADAE), $280 must be provided unless that amount is raised with a levy of less than 11.5 mills.
4. If a levy of 11.5 mills raises more than $280 per pupil (ADAE), $300 must be provided unless that amount is raised with a levy of less than 10 mills.
5. If a 10 mill levy raises more than $300 per pupil (ADAE), the foundation levy must be such that it will provide $380 per pupil of average daily attendance entitlement in the district.

COED's recommendations were more generous than the final version of the new school foundation act. One provision, struck from the bill on the Senate floor, would have provided $8.22 million in additional funds for students from economically deprived areas.

Between 1969 and 1972 the issue of making changes in the basic structure of the foundation act was never back on the floor of either the House or the

Senate. However, in 1971 the interim Committee on State and Local Finance considered various school finance recommendations. What happened when some of the recommendations were put to the legislature is best recounted in the Colorado State Department of Education's newspaper, Education Colorado:

> Financial limitations and budget restrictions were the recurrent themes of the 1971 session of the Colorado General Assembly...A drive to raise the state minimum equalization level to $480 brought House approval of the increase, but the Senate passed a bill freezing the state level of support at the present level of $460. The House and Senate were unable to reach agreement on this issue, and the stalemate means that the General Assembly took no action on the vital question of state school support...Although the Foundation Act required the legislature to "review" the level of support this year, an informal opinion by the Attorney General's Office ruled that the present $460 level of support could continue without specific legislative action.[43]

The following year, 1972, was a "short session" of the legislature, which meant that the legislature could consider only those issues introduced by the Governor. The Governor worded his call that year so that only the level of funding could be considered. As a result, House Bill 1058 raised the equalization level of support under the Public School Foundation Act to $518 per ADAE. This bill in no way changed the basic act other than increasing the level of support from $460 per ADAE to $518 per ADAE.

The year 1973 saw a marked increase in activity and interest regarding public school finance in Colorado. The appearance of two property tax initiatives on the November 1972 ballot provided a major impetus for change. Initiative Seven, sponsored by the Colorado Limitation Committee, would have provided for a property tax limit of one and one half per cent; Initiative Twelve, sponsored by Colorado Project Common Cause, would have replaced property taxes with other types of levies.

The Governor, along with Democratic Senator Allen Dines, headed a bipartisan committee to campaign against these initiatives. This committee included both state officials and representatives of the private sector.

The basic contention of the committee was that while changes in the school finance program must be made, they should be made as a result of the regular legislative process. To reinforce this contention, the Governor predicted that action would be taken by the upcoming legislature because of the expressed concern by the people about the property tax. The efforts of this committee proved to be effective. The two initiatives were soundly defeated on the November 8 ballot.

Although the two property tax amendments were defeated in November of 1972, the discussion concerning the creation of the proposed amendments had begun before the 1972 General Assembly came to an end. House Joint Resolution 1046 (1972) was written specifically to urge the defeat of the proposed amendments. Excerpts from this resolution read as follows:

> Be it resolved...That the General Assembly publicly express its concern about these two proposed initiated amendments...and that the General Assembly therefore recommends that the electors of the State of Colorado give careful consideration to these issues before signing initiative petitions or casting their votes.
>
> Be it further resolved, that the General Assembly recognizes that inequities exist in the distribution of property tax burdens and that the entire public school finance program should be reviewed in depth; and that the...Committee on State and Local Finance is hereby directed to conduct a purposeful study of public school finance and related tax problems and to submit for the consideration by the first regular session of the forty-ninth General Assembly, a new plan for the financing of public schools which will adequately provide for the funding of education programs, reduce the dependence upon property taxation for financing public schools, provide equity in the distribution of property tax burdens, and assure local control in the operation and management of public schools.[44]

Primarily as a result of this legislation, the interim Committee on State and Local Finance met seven times during the 1972 interim period. The committee's basic concerns were methods of revising the 1969 School Foundation Act and reducing the local school districts' reliance on property tax as a major source of revenue. During the committee meetings, input was received

from various individuals and groups; however, COED and Ray Carber, Property Tax Administrator (an appointed government official), were called upon most often for expert opinion and advice.

COED, still a viable group since its inception in 1967, presented five school finance "alternatives" to the committees. These alternatives can be grouped into two categories. The first three alternatives included increases in the state's share of the foundation program under the formula used in the 1969 School Foundation Act. The final two alternatives used a "power equalization" approach by which the state would equalize the "buying power" of each mill levied by local districts. The Committee on State and Local Finance selected COED's alternative IV (Power Equalization) as its choice for a new school finance formula. Shortly after the General Assembly convened in January of 1973, this recommendation appeared as House Bill 1062.

Four additional school finance bills appeared in January of 1973. The Colorado Education Association's proposal, House Bill 1152, was basically COED's alternative IV with a few additions. Two other bills, House Bill 1149 and House Bill 1112, were submitted by Representatives Kirscht and Bledsoe respectively. The remaining proposal, House Bill 1135, came from the Governo and was considered to be in strong competition with the COED bill.

The Governor's plan utilized a "per cent equalization" formula, a form of power equalizing, which would, if implemented, approximately double state support for school districts and would require an appropriation of about $390.5 million during the year 1974. The fact that the Governor submitted a school finance plan was a surprise in itself to many people as he had been relatively inactive in former years with regard to education. However, an even greater surprise to most people was the fact that the Governor's bill contained $47 million more dollars than the other school finance proposals.

As the five school finance proposals were considered by the forty-ninth General Assembly there was much discussion as to the strengths and weaknesses of the various proposals. With the COED plan falling way short of the Governor's in terms of money, COED was asked by legislative leaders to revise its plan with the added $47 million. COED did so and came up with yet another alternative, termed by COED "a better idea." This alternative still was based on the power equalization concept, but incorporated the additional money as well as a few ideas from the other proposals.

Near the end of the 1973 session, the Colorado General Assembly passed the Public School Finance Act of 1973 (House Bill 1562). As had been predicted by a number of informants, the final bill was based on COED's "power equalization" concept, and it also picked up parts of the Governor's bill. Also included in the bill were amendments concerning teacher tenure. One such amendment provided that any teacher employed for his or her fourth year in the same school district shall receive tenure automatically without further action on the part of the school board or of the teachers.

While the bill did not incorporate the Governor's proposed formula, the "power equalization" concept did provide for the tax relief he had vigorously sought. The 1973 bill guaranteed twenty-five dollars (1974) for each pupil for each mill levied by all school districts. This provision should permit most of the heavily burdened districts to lower their mill levies.

Following is a brief example of how power equalization could work to lower a mill levy. District X was able to raise fifteen dollars per ADAE per mill last year. If District X levied a thirty mill levy, the revenue received per ADAE from local property taxes would have been $450. However, with the guaranteed twenty-five dollars per mill under the new legislation, a thirty mill levy for the same district would result in a revenue of $750

per ADAE. If District X decided to maintain the original amount of property tax revenue ($450), it could then lower its levy to eighteen mills.

As a way of providing more equalization among school districts, the finance bill also placed limitations on the authorized revenue base per pupil. Districts with lower per pupil revenue bases (the amount a district receives per pupil from property tax revenue plus state equalization) are permitted to increase their bases by a greater percentage yearly than are those districts with higher revenue bases. For example, if a school district's revenue base is $801-850 per ADAE, the following year it would be permitted to increase this base by eleven per cent. On the other hand, if a school district's revenue base is over $1,000 per ADAE, it would be allowed only a seven per cent increase for the following year.

Both as a safety factor to provide for exceptional cases and as a way to implement the finance program most efficiently, the bill provided for a State School District Budget Review Board. This Board is composed of the Lieutenant Governor, who is to serve as Chairman, the State Treasurer, and the Chairman of the State Board of Education. The staff for the Board will be provided by the State Commissioner of Education.

It appears that through the cooperative efforts of the Governor, COED, and the General Assembly, Colorado has gone a long way in solving the state's difficult school finance problems. The 1973 law decreased the heavy burden placed on the local property tax because of school financing by increasing the state's contribution to educational financing and equalizing the "buying power" among districts. The "power equalization" concept also helps to decrease revenue raising disparities among school districts as well as differences in the amount of dollars available for allocation per pupil in each school district. And, finally, all of these factors contribute to making education less of a direct function of the property tax than it was with the previous formula.

While roles and relationships will be dealt with in the last section, this section has highlighted the roles played by some of Colorado's policy actors when working the area of school finance. For example, the General Assembly's interim finance committee typically served as the formal initiator of school finance legislation. Also, the coalition, COED, worked closely with the legislative committee and was instrumental in the initiation and passage of both the 1969 and 1973 school finance legislation.

While the Colorado Department of Education, a member of COED, did not sponsor its own finance legislation, it appeared to have had significant input into the COED proposal; and in 1973 the Department also played a role in the development of the Governor's own school finance plan. A final note, the Governor, who had previously not played a major role in educational issues, became a major participant in Colorado's 1973 school finance reform movement.

Since accountability is related to fiscal realities, it is closely integrated with school finance. Before passing the 1973 school finance law, the General Assembly had passed several accountability laws which will be described in the following section. It is likely that these laws appeased what otherwise may have been a resistant legislature and helped to pave the way for Colorado's school finance reform.

Educational Accountability

One of the most hotly debated issues in education in recent years has been that of accountability. Colorado, a forerunner in the accountability movement, passed three major pieces of accountability legislation in 1971. One of the difficulties of the accountability concept is that it can be defined in a number of ways. For instance, some people say that accountability simply means that educators must prove (be accountable) to the taxpayers that

they are getting their money's worth out of the dollars invested in education. While this practical viewpoint is certainly a part of accountability, accountability can also be defined in other terms. For some, accountability is largely a matter of needs assessment.

When he was Commissioner of Education in Colorado (1971-1973), Donald Woodington described needs assessment in a discussion of Colorado's accountability legislation:

> Educators ask the local school board: "What do you think public education should provide?" Board members assess their community's needs and expectations. They then translate those into educational goals.
>
> Teachers ask parents: "What do you want your child to learn in school?" Parents assess their families' expectations. They they sit with the teachers and translate their hopes into educational objectives.
>
> Legislators ask educators: "What are you doing with the money we appropriate for education?" School administrators, teachers, counselors, and staff get together and do some figuring: What are the costs, etc.
>
> Educators ask one another: "What can we accomplish with the money that is made available? Do we use it well?" They get together again and decide that, for these children to reach agreed-upon performance objectives, certain programs and resources are needed.
>
> And so the process goes. This is dialogue. This is needs assessment translated into goals and objectives. This is the basis for performance evaluation. It all adds up to accountability.[45]

Woodington's viewpoint of accountability essentially defines the basic process utilized in Colorado's accountability legislation. This continual process is: 1) assessing educational needs, 2) setting goals, 3) specifying performance objectives, 4) designing a program based on the designated goals and objectives, and 5) evaluating the effectiveness of the educational program

The three pieces of accountability legislation passed in 1971 included 1) the Educational Accountability Act, 2) the Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, and 3) the Program Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation System Act. While this legislation was formulated by a legislative study committee

(The Committee on Public Education), the accountability movement actually began in Colorado a number of years before the legislation was passed.

Over a period of years the Colorado Department of Education, aware of the shortcomings of the state's educational system, had been discussing the need for clarifying goals and objectives in education. This topic was set forth at Board meetings held throughout the state and in various speeches by Byron Hansford who was Commissioner of Education from 1960 to 1971. In fact, Hansford had frequently urged the legislature to create a legislative study committee to study educational accountability.

The Department itself began to deal with some aspects of accountability as early as 1962. In that year the statement Goals for Education in Colorado was prepared by the State Board of Education. Through the use of these state goals the Colorado Evaluation Project, a task force in the Department, developed educational objectives and performance criteria.[46] According to a recent study of accountability in Colorado by Leonard Burns, "The Colorado Evaluation Project was based upon the National Assessment Program and sought to resolve some persistent and vital issues in education at the state level.[47]

Another plan relating to accountability was developed by the State Department of Education in 1970. This plan originated in 1964 when the Division of Accreditation began to search for a better method of increasing the quality of education for school children in Colorado.[48] Then, in September of 1970 a Contract Accreditation plan was developed to encourage districts to implement a comprehensive educational planning program. The relationship between this plan and the actual accountability legislation was described in Burns' study:

> The "accreditation by contract" plan essentially includes the assessment of needs by the school districts, the establishment of objectives into action statements leading to a plan of operation with needed assistance supplied by the State Department of Education. These same characteristics later emerged in the accountability legislation.[49]

While the State Department of Education was beginning to deal with accountability related projects, the General Assembly was also beginning to consider accountability as an important issue in education. The General Assembly, however, focused the need for accountability toward the Department itself. The Joint Budget Committee, which had the final word on educational appropriations, became especially concerned with questions of education results. Pressured yearly for increases in education allocations, the committee began to ask, "What for?" It became apparent that the Joint Budget Committee, along with the General Assembly as a whole, felt strongly that the state education agency had a major accountability responsibility. This belief was given specific form when the Joint Budget Committee commissioned two separate studies of the State Department of Education to be done by outside consultants.

In 1969 the Joint Budget Committee authorized Fry Consultants to conduct an independent study of the Department's effectiveness and impact. This study was to assess the Department in the following areas: (1) impact on local school districts, (2) administrative effectiveness and efficiency, (3) accountability for resources, and (4) consistency of Department objectives with work actually being performed.

The findings of the Fry Report indicated that while the Colorado Department of Education was ranked among the top six to ten such departments by the U.S. Office of Education, the actual activities of the department had not led to any real impact. The Department, the study remarked, had "notable" administrative and personnel deficiencies. Another finding was that there were deficiencies in the setting of departmental priorities as well as priorities of the Colorado educational system. While this is not a complete list of the Fry Consultants' findings, these examples do give the gist of the report. The Fry Report also offered a comprehensive list of

recommendations regarding Colorado's educational system. Included among the recommendations were suggestions for redefining the management responsibilities of the CDE as well as ideas for strengthening personnel administration in the Department.[50]

Shortly after the Fry Report was submitted to the Joint Budget Committee, the Committee, apparently not completely satisfied with the study, commissioned the Stanford Research Institute to conduct a more comprehensive study. The purpose of this study was: 1) to study Colorado's system of elementary and secondary education, 2) to define the role and assess the performance of the Department of Education, and 3) to recommend changes and improvements in the system and its operations. The findings of the Stanford Research Institute Study were similar to those of the study previously cited; and they pointed even more strongly in the direction of educational accountability. Some of the findings of this report were as follows:

> 1) Elementary and secondary schools...cost the people of Colorado about $150 million in state taxes in FY 1970-71. A number of Colorado students, parents, and employees believe that the cost is much too high for the value they are receiving. They are being asked by the Department of Education for an additional $32 million in 1971-72...
>
> 2) The people of Colorado believe that the Department of Education has not provided, through the state's school system, the type of education they want.
>
> 3) The State Board of Education has not been responsive to public opinion in the establishment of educational policies and programs.
>
> 4) The people, the General Assembly, and the Governor of Colorado have no effective control over the Board or the Department of Education. They can attempt redirection primarily through budgetary action and the denial of state funds for undesired programs.
>
> 5) The Legislature must initiate action to redirect the course of education in Colorado to make it responsive to public opinion and control.[51]

While the two studies covered many areas, both "criticized the Department sharply for not leading out more strongly toward better public education--for not setting clear goals, objectives, and standards for school

districts."[52] Both reports suggested the adoption of an accountability program as a way to solve the state's education problems.

A prior action of the legislature which opened the door for the 1971 accountability legislation occurred in 1969. In that year the forty-seventh Colorado General Assembly passed Senate Joint Resolution 14 establishing a committee to study education in Colorado. This Committee on Public Education was to be comprised of four members of the House of Representatives, four members of the Senate, and seven members from the general public appointed by the Governor. As explained in the resolution, the purpose of the study was "to conduct a comprehensive and systematic evaluation of the organization, structure, function, and efficiency of the state's public elementary and secondary school system both at state and local levels."[53] This committee was requested to report to the Governor and the forty-eighth General Assembly not later than January 1, 1971.

In December of 1970 the Committee on Public Education, having worked closely with the Department of Education, submitted the requested report to the Governor and General Assembly. Included in the introduction of this report was the following statement giving the committee's rationale with respect to the concept of accountability for education:

> Public education may be suffering some lack of confidence from a variety of sources--the taxpayers, parents and students, as well as legislators and others. The broad concept of "accountability" which can take a number of valid forms, offers hope for bridging a "credibility gap" between the promises made for the system and its actual performance. An integral part of the accountability concept is provision for improving communication between interested groups.[54]

With the hope of bridging the educational system's "credibility gaps," the committee recommended three bills dealing with accountability. These bills were subsequently passed by the forty-seventh General Assembly (1971). The passage of the bills was apparently done by the Legislature with little

fanfare. According to respondents, the state's educational interest groups had little to do with either the formulation or passage of the three accountability laws. In fact, one respondent from the Colorado Education Association remarked that the accountability legislation "caught us by surprise."

A brief synopsis of each of the accountability bills follows:

The Educational Accountability Act gave the State Board of Education responsibility for developing and supervising an accountability program. For this purpose, the initial legislative appropriation was $40,000. The bill also specified that a State Accountability Committee be set up to work in an advisory capacity with the State Board of Education. This committee was to consist of three persons named by the Speaker of the House, two by the President of the Senate, five by the Governor, and seven by the State Board of Education.

Also, the local boards of education were to appoint their own local advisory accountability committees (or boards). These committees were to consist of at least one parent, one teacher, one school administrator, and one taxpayer. Local school board members were permitted to serve on this committee.

Finally, this bill specified that in December of each year the local accountability boards must report to both district residents and the State Board of Education on each school district's progress with respect to the stated goals and objectives.

The second piece of accountability legislation, The Comprehensive Educational Planning Act, was designed to stimulate the concept of long range planning in school districts. The bill carried an appropriation of $90,000 and offered the incentive grants of up to $5,000 to districts to be matched with local funds.

The three basic components of the plan were: 1) the evaluation of present educational programs, 2) the formulation of district educational goals, and 3) the development of a plan designed to meet these goals. The bill stated that community members, professional personnel, and students must be continually involved in this planning process. It also stated that the State Board of Education was to report to the General Assembly by February 1972 as to the progress of districts involved in long range planning.

The final piece of accountability legislation was The Program Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation System Act. This act required all districts by July 1973 to implement an accounting system relating to pupil achievement. The State Department of Education was designated to define and direct the PPBES program. This piece of legislation was the only one of three accountability bills to carry with it a penalty. The penalty was that any school system which did not establish a PPBES program, "shall forfeit an amount equal to ten per cent of its ensuing year's Public School Foundation monies." This bill carried with it an appropriation of $40,000 and required local school districts to report to the State Board of Education as to their progress twice each year.[55]

The accountability package included two important directives relating to Colorado's educational policy-making process. The first one was the fact that the State Board of Education was given the responsibility for developing and supervising the accountability program. The second directive was the establishment of a State Accountability Committee to work in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education.

The Colorado State Board of Education is assigned the "general supervision" of public education by the Colorado Constitution.[56] What is meant by general supervision has remained rather vague. Partially as a result of this, the Board has traditionally held only loose reins on the local school

districts. While the Board could collect data from the local districts and attempt to give them direction, the Board exercised little direct control over the state's local school districts. The passage of the Accountability Law by the General Assembly gave the State Board of Education new authority and literally forced it into a new supervisory role with regard to the local school districts.

On the other hand, the establishment of the State Accountability Committee indicated that while the Legislature wanted the Board to take a more forceful role, the Legislature still wanted to be able to maintain a "watchdog" stance over the State Board of Education. The fact that a substantial portion of the membership of the committee was to be composed of legislators indicated that the General Assembly wanted to take an active part in the accountability process. This provision indicated as well that, unlike many Board advisory committees, this committee was essentially guaranteed access to Colorado's General Assembly.

In 1973 the Colorado Department of Education reported on the first six months of operation of the 1971 Accountability Law. Their report indicated that the local school districts' response to the legislation had been generally positive. For instance, 97 per cent of the districts had already appointed local accountability advisory committees. Sixty-five, or about one-third of the Colorado school districts planned to have an open meeting on educational goals. The report also indicated that about 20 per cent of the districts were beginning to establish performance objectives. However, there was need for improvement in some areas. For instance, the report indicated that most school districts had not involved a wide base of participants in the development of objectives. Also, infrequent disclosure reports (i.e. student achievement test grades to parents, etc.) indicated that persons most closely connected with education received limited amounts of outcome information.[57]

While in the process of implementing the accountability legislation, Colorado continued its leadership role in the accountability movement when the Cooperative Accountability Project was established in 1972. This seven state, three year project was financed by Title V funds of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with Colorado designated as the administering state. The other participating states are: Florida, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, and Wisconsin. The overall purpose of this project was to develop an accountability system which could serve as a model for all state education agencies.[58]

In summary, respondents have indicated that the initial statewide acceptance of accountability for education in Colorado has generally been quite positive. In fact, it does not appear evident that the accountability movement in Colorado, at any stage, has had to face any major opposition or resistance. Mentioned, but only in terms of minor importance, was a difficulty in some districts in acquiring the necessary community participation in accountability activities; and the resistance of some local superintendents to the creation of the local advisory boards on accountability. The results of the accountability legislation have only begun to be discernable.

The roles played by the state policy actors appear to be quite different when one compares the school finance issue with the accountability issue. While the educational interest groups (as a part of COED) were major initiators with respect to school finance, they apparently did not play a particularly active role in the accountability movement. Although the state educational agency did play an important part in the early development of Colorado's accountability movement, the major initiator of the legislation appeared to be the General Assembly. By passing three accountability acts and by establishing a State Accountability Committee, the legislators provided a vehicle for the Assembly by which it could maintain input into the the statewide accountability process.

While Colorado reacted to its financial and communications problems in education by passing recent legislation dealing with school finance reform and educational accountability, the state's reaction to its racial concerns has been quite different. We turn now to the desegregation issue.

School Desegregation

Although Colorado has not passed state legislation dealing specifically with school desegregation, this issue has become quite controversial within the state during recent years. This section will attempt to draw the background of school desegregation in Colorado, outline recent state level activity in this area (including the Denver Court cases), and, finally, to examine why school desegregation in Colorado has not resulted in statewide action.

First, let us begin with some recent statistics regarding the state's pupil and teacher populations. During the school year 1970-71, the one hundred and eighty-one school districts of Colorado had a total pupil population of 550,060 and a total teacher population of 24,774. The total number of minority pupils (including American Indians, blacks, Orientals, and Spanish speaking) was 92,250 or 18.5 per cent. The total number of minority teachers was 1,151 or 4.9 per cent. Also, the total school population of Denver during the 1970-71 school year was 97,928 and Denver's total minority population was 37,474 or approximately 33 per cent.[59]

The distribution of minority pupils in the state is especially important when considering desegregation. One should note that 76 per cent of the state's total black pupil population attends schools within the Denver school district, while only 32 per cent of the state's Spanish surnamed pupils attend schools in Denver. From these figures, we can see that the Spanish surnamed pupils are more widely distributed across the state than are the blacks.

When discussing school desegregation, Coloradans frequently point to

the fact that their state constitution provides a legal framework for non-discrimination. Article IX, sections 2 and 8, of the state constitution stipulates that no discrimination, based on race, ethnic background, or religion may be practiced in Colorado.

Article IX, section 2, as noted before, reads as follows:

> Establishment and maintenance of public schools--The General Assembly shall, as soon as practicable, provide for the establishment and maintenance of a thorough and uniform system of free public schools throughout the state, wherein all residents of the state, between the ages of six and twenty-one years, may be educated gratuitously.

Article IX, section 8 reads as follows:

> Religious tests and race discrimination forbidden -Sectarian tenets -No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as a teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color.[60]

The existing statutory provisions which relate to public school desegregation include the 1951 Colorado Anti-Discrimination Act and three bills (Senate Bills 61 and 424 and House Bill 1129) passed in 1969. The three bills were directed toward providing equal opportunity to all pupils, and the language did not specifically mention desegregation. The most commonly referred to of the three bills is Senate Bill 61--English Language. This bill provides that languages other than English may be used in teaching and encourages multi-lingual programs. It was designed to correct an 1888 law requiring all classes to be taught in English.[61] One might note that the U.S. Supreme Court in Meyer v. State of Nebraska (262 U.S. 390) had stricken a similar requirement in Nebraska in 1922.[62]

The Colorado Department of Education has attempted to aid desegregation through its Equal Opportunity Program, managed by the Community Services Unit which is located in the Department's Office of Field Services. In 1968,

the Community Services Unit was added to the Department (under the name Intercultural Community Relations) "...with the specific purpose to assist school districts with problems incident to school desegregation and racial and ethnic isolation."[63] This unit serves as an advisory body to the State Commissioner of Education, the State Board of Education, state and local accountability committees, and community agencies. It also serves in a consultant relationship in the School Improvement Process on policy development and implementation. In addition, all information, analyses, surveys, and statistics compiled by the Unit are available to school districts. The Equal Opportunity Program has four major objectives: 1) more equalization of educational opportunity, 2) better intergroup relations, 3) promotion of integrated schools, and 4) the development of quality education.[64]

It should be mentioned here that Title IV consultants in the Colorado Department of Education have also concentrated their efforts on the desegregation of Colorado schools. Also, the Department as a whole has consistently urged "...school districts to eliminate de facto segregation and to remove all policies that are inconsistent with (their) philosophy."[65]

While the Department has taken some action in the desegregation area, it appears that the State Board of Education has remained relatively inactive. In fact, one board member interviewed made the statement, "Anything done will have to come from some other authority." The Board's most notable effort regarding desegregation was the "Policy Statement on Equality in Education" adopted by the State Board of Education on May 14, 1968. This statement reads as follows:

> The Colorado Board of Education, recognizing that equality of educational opportunity is fundamental to the achievement of a democratic society, pledges itself to the full use of its powers in assuring such equality to all Colorado children.

> The Board calls upon local boards of education to institute programs to eliminate segregation in the school community. Local school districts are invited and encouraged to call upon the State Departments of Education for assistance in exploring new and promising methods of insuring genuine equality of educational opportunity.
>
> It will be the policy of the State Board of Education to assess the progress of such improvements in the schools and to report periodically to the public.[66]

To this date, the Board as a whole has made no other statement on the desegregation issue, although some individual Board members have been active within their own districts in promoting school desegregation.

As mentioned previously, 76 per cent of Colorado's black student population attend schools in Denver. As a result, Denver has been the location of most of the state's desegregation activity. In October of 1968, the Denver school board approved an integration plan which had been developed by a citizen committee. However, the school board election held in May of 1969 resulted in the overwhelming defeat of two incumbent members who were strong integration advocates. Their two replacements had campaigned on an anti-integration theme and opposed the integration plan developed by the committee. After the election the school board voted against the integration plan (4 - 3) and therefore the plan was rescinded.

Shortly after the board's vote, the NAACP filed suit to get the original plan for the integration of the Denver schools reinstated. In March of 1970, the district court judge, Judge William Doyle, ruled against the Denver school board saying that actions by the board in northeast Denver had constituted de jure segregation. He ordered the board's original plan to be reimposed. In addition, he ordered a busing plan to integrate the entire Denver system.

The case was then taken to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals (August of 1970). This court supported Doyle on the de jure portion of the ruling,

but said that the systemwide desegregation order had gone too far. "In effect, the appeals court held that the core-city school segregation was an educational matter, not one to be decided by the federal courts."[67] This decision was immediately appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court by the NAACP. In June of 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled "...that the Denver School Board must prove it did not deliberately segregate students by race in drawing school boundaries and in other actions. If the board cannot prove this, it must racially balance the entire school system..."[68]

The Supreme Court Case (Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado) was significant in that it was the first case heard by the Court concerning a school system that had never operated under a provision mandating (or permitting) racial segregation.[69] According to Thomas A. Shannon in a recent article:

> "Keyes" will have a profound impact upon school districts outside the South which have long regarded themselves untouchable by the courts because their racial segregation has been of a de facto nature. "Keyes" says that what was once comfortably categorized as de facto may indeed be de jure. Essentially, "Keyes" has enormously broadened the de jure concept.[70]

The Denver situation has been, and remains, volatile. When busing started in 1970, about thirty-eight buses were destroyed in violent protest. "White Flight," the movement of whites to the suburbs, appears to be a continuing trend and has resulted in a decreased enrollment in Denver of more than three thousand white pupils since 1968.[71]

As one recalls the recent events in Denver, as well as the statewide distribution of minority groups in Colorado, some reasons for the lack of activity regarding school desegregation at the state level become apparent. Most often mentioned by respondents was the fact that 76 per cent of Colorado's black pupils are in Denver. This fact, combined with the state's strong adherence to the concept of local control, results in the simply

stated rationale: "It's Denver's problem." With many legislators and educators holding to this position, state level action is avoided. The only alternative available, then, as a legal recourse for desegregation advocates is provided by the courts. This is exemplified when we see that black organizations such as the NAACP have focused their attention on the courts rather than on the Colorado State Legislature.

At the same time, the Spanish-Americans, much more widely dispersed around the state than the blacks, have not been able to organize themselves effectively enough to promote action at the state level. At present, disparate Chicano groups hold to conflicting philosophies, and, among these groups, many are strongly opposed to integration.

Another reason for lack of activity at the state level with regard to desegregation stems from forces which resist change and/or are opposed to integration. Indications of such resistance appeared in 1970 when the Colorado Department of Education reported on the "Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups":

> ....the progress toward equal educational opportunity for all school pupils has been very slow. Evidence...is available to show that resistance to change by certain elements of the population has been one of the strong barriers to progress toward this goal. Except for a few instances, the desired changes have not been made at a rate that will lead to more equitable participation in the learning process by all school pupils.[72]

Another more tangible indication of resistance to change was quite evident in Denver's desegregation history. Denver's battle, over four years old, is likely not over yet.

In conclusion, we see that although 1968 surveys showed "...some grave inconsistencies in school policies with respect to minorities in at least 72 of the state's 181 school districts,"[73] Colorado educators and politicians have not really done much to tackle the desegregation problems at the state level through appropriate legislation or State Board regulation. In short, desegregation does not appear to be considered a "state" problem by many of

the agencies, organizations, and individuals having the power to promote change. As a result, state and federal courts are setting school desegregation policy in Colorado in place of these decisions being made by the legislature or the state education agency.

THE STATE EDUCATIONAL POLICY-MAKING PROCESS

The educational policy-making process of any state is a complex phenomenon, and Colorado proves to be no exception. The relationships among state government, the state education agency, and the educational interest groups are not easily determined or explained. Fortunately, however, some patterns and unifying themes have emerged, and the identification of these themes should be helpful to a clearer understanding of the policy-making process.

First, we find in Colorado the unique existence of an enduring and powerful education coalition. This coalition, the Council on Educational Development (or COED), is made up of both education and non-education interest groups and has, over the years, been primarily concerned with school finance. Second, the state education agency (the State Commissioner of Education, the State Department of Education, and the State Board of Education) has become increasingly involved in the educational policy-making process and has gained a new and improved credibility in the eyes of other important actors. Third, in recent years both the Governor and the General Assembly have expressed an increased interest in education issues such as school finance and accountability.

The following analysis will discuss the educational interest groups, the state education agency, and state government in that order, and will be based primarily upon the roles played by these actors, particularly in the three issue areas discussed above, and the relationships among them.

The Role of Educational Interest Groups

Unlike most states, Colorado has maintained an enduring and powerful education coalition for a number of years. The Council on Educational Development or COED was formed in the early fall of 1967 in an attempt to solve

some of Colorado's basic education problems, especially in the area of school finance. COED is unusual in two important ways. First, the coalition consists of both education and non-education interest groups, and one department of government, and, second, COED is made up entirely of officers and staff members of the organizations they represent.

Six of the eight original groups on COED's Board of Directors are still active in COED. They are: the Colorado Association of School Boards, the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, the Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry, the Colorado Education Association, the Colorado State Department of Education, and the Colorado Association of School Executives. Two of the original eight members, the Colorado Labor Council and the Colorado Public Expenditure Council, have withdrawn. In addition, the following groups have participated since COED's inception: the Colorado Woolgrowers, the Colorado Grange, the Colorado Cattle Feeders, the Colorado Federation of Teachers, the Farmers Union, the Colorado Farm Bureau, the State Board of Community Colleges and Occupational Education, and the Colorado PTA.

It is important to note that the Governor and the legislature recognized the coalition and realized a need for an official body through which COED could communicate its views to the legislature. For this purpose, the Fiscal Policy Committee was established. This interim committee consisted of eight legislators and seven lay members who were, in most cases, representatives of COED.[74]

During its first two years, COED raised $30,000 to finance a major research study of Colorado's finance system. In addition, COED was instrumental in the drafting and passage of S.B. 127 (the 1969 School Foundation Act) which was discussed in the previous section.

COED's unlikely combination of education, business, labor, government, and agriculture groups was difficult to achieve and has been difficult to

maintain. Its members fondly refer to the coalition as "an unholy alliance." A COED paper aptly described one of its original human relations problems:

> It is merely stating the obvious to report that COED's first several months of operation were tumultous and that much time was spent in coaxing various members back to the conference table. However, after a reasonable period, there developed a spirit of give and take which permitted members to insult each other with impunity, and the discussions proceeded with vim and vigor![75]

While COED's existence and endurance may reflect the determination of combined membership, many members place a great deal of credit for its success to its founder and President, Frank Miles. Miles, who is also the executive director of the Colorado Association of School Boards (CASB), was often referred to during interviews as the "spokesman for education in Colorado." Through the years he has built up a strong base of relationships with all of the major educational policy-making actors. Judging from comments made by people interviewed, the president of COED has given the group able leadership and has been responsible in large measure for the group's success.

Even though COED has survived for six years, it remains a combustible organization. While a natural strain exists in the relationship between education and non-education groups when dealing with school finance problems, the Colorado education groups themselves tend to divide on some issues. However, all except one of the educational interest groups respondents interviewed felt that the education groups do work together on most issues. All of these respondents listed the divisive issues as usually being teacher tenure, collective bargaining, and other controversial labor-management type conflicts.

The divisive issues cited indicate a split between the teachers' groups (CEA and CFT) and other education organizations. The tendency for the education groups to divide on such issues was illustrated with the recent (1973) school finance proposals. Although an active member of COED, the Colorado

Education Association decided to write its own proposal in order to incorporate some of the items dealing with teachers' rights into the bill.

On the management side, our respondents reported that the school boards' association (CASB) and the administrators' association (CASE) tend to work together on education issues, sometimes in opposition to the CEA.

Another tendency for groups within the coalition to split on certain issues was revealed when we asked respondents about the relationship between the Colorado Department of Education and the CEA. Long standing disagreements reportedly have occurred between these two organizations over issues of certification and a desire for more self-governance on the part of the teaching profession.

Even though these strained relationships exist among COED members, there is no indication that the coalition is on the verge of disbanding. In fact, it is likely that the fact that dissenting groups feel free to actively disagree with the group (i.e. CEA's proposal) has contributed to the ultimate strength of the group as a whole.

Educational Interest Groups and the State Education Agency

Colorado's educational interest groups automatically share a working relationship with the state's education agency through COED. The Colorado Department of Education, an active member of the coalition, is always represented at COED meetings by either its legislative liaison, an Assistant Commissioner, or the Commissioner of Education himself. The State Board of Education is also a member of COED, however, Board members themselves are usually not present at COED meetings.

The majority of educational interest group leaders interviewed felt that their groups had had a good working relationship with Donald Woodington when he was Commissioner of Education. The same respondents indicated that they were usually consulted when the Colorado Department of Education was

considering a major policy issue. The CEA representatives indicated that their strained relationship with the CDE (which was previously mentioned) was improving. Perhaps one factor contributing to this improving relationship was the fact that a new CDE legislative liaison formerly worked for the teachers' association.

With only one exception, the eight interest group representatives interviewed indicated that there was a general lack of communication between their groups and the State Board of Education. They generally expressed the feelings that the Commissioner communicated to them ideas from the Board, and that the State Board of Education itself was not an appropriate focus for a concerted lobbying effort on the part of the interest groups. As one interest group leader put it, his group goes through the motions of working with the Board, but the legislature is "where the action is." Not surprisingly, then, five out of six education leaders felt that the State Board of Education does not ever take the lead in promoting education legislation. Some of their typical comments indicated that from their point of view the Board is a reactive body, that it formalizes the Commissioner's recommendations rather than gives real direction, and that "they just don't do that much." A few respondents indicated a feeling that the State Board of Education may be changing (i.e. by being more aggressive) but that it is too early to say this for certain.

The one exception to the overall lack of contact between education groups and the State Board of Education was the Colorado Association of School Boards. Their leader indicated that his group does work directly with the Board on policy issues. The fact that several State Board members are also members of local school boards probably influences this relationship. We shall also note here that this particular representative also is president of COED.

Educational Interest Groups and the Governor

Essentially, all of the education group respondents agreed concerning Governor Love's role in educational policy making. Most of them felt that he had not been an education-oriented governor, and that he had only recently (1973) become involved in education when he presented his school finance proposal to the General Assembly. Even so, five of six respondents questioned indicated that they have had no major disagreements with the Governor and that they generally agreed with his positions and his philosophy. Those interviewed emphasized, however, that while Love's educational philosophy had been good, he did not back up his ideas with action. In other words, the educational interest group leaders did not agree with the Governor on the basis of his action, but on his lack of action.

However, the CEA representatives interviewed were more critical of the Governor and indicated that the teachers had had disagreements with the Governor over a number of policy issues. The fact that the CEA elected to back Love's opponent during the 1970 election did nothing to enhance this relationship.

Table 4

LEGISLATOR RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF WHICH EDUCATION GROUPS ARE USUALLY THE MOST INFLUENTIAL WHEN EDUCATION AND SCHOOL FINANCE MATTERS ARE BEING DEALT WITH BY THE LEGISLATURE (N=14)

	Republican	Democrat	Total
CASB	6	6	12
CEA	5	6	11
CASE	3	2	6
CDE	4	0	4
COED	1	1	2
Denver Public Schools	0	1	1

Partially as a result of this strained relationship, the education represenatives felt CASB to be the most influential educational interest group

with the Governor.

On the whole, it does not appear that the education groups had a close working relationship with the Governor's office with the exception, again, of the school boards' association (CASB). There was regular communication between CASB and the Governor's office. In fact, the Governor's office solicited information from CASB when the Governor was working on his school finance proposal. Again recalling that the CASB respondent also represented COED, we find that he was the only education leader to have established a working relationship with the Governor as well as with the State Board of Education. This leader, as a result, had formed a pattern of relationships and communication channels which were unique among the education interest group leaders.

Education Interest Groups and the General Assembly

When asked which educational interest groups were most influential with the legislature, the majority of legislators interviewed named CASB as their first choice, as can be seen in Table 4. They also saw the education groups as among the top interest groups in Colorado, and perceived their primary source of influence with legislators to be the ability to provide accurate, reliable information and data.

Rather than hire a separate lobbyist for COED, the education groups lobby legislators separately either in keeping with their own interests or as representatives of a COED policy. The education groups themselves tend to see this diversified lobbying technique as a primary source of influence for the coalition. All of the education groups give legislative lobbying high priority, as the legislature, in the words of one respondent, is "where the decisions are made."

As was mentioned before, COED has a direct link with the General Assembly

54

through the interim Committee on State and Local Finance (previously the Committee on Fiscal Policy). This integral relationship between COED and the law-making body was depicted during the 1972 interim session as they worked jointly on school finance. COED members were present at every legislative committee meeting, and, judging from a review of the minutes from the meetings, COED provided the basis for the committee's activity. The committee subsequently adopted one of COED's finance proposals and it was submitted in the form of a bill to the General Assembly.

The Role of the State Education Agency

In the past, the state education agency, including the Colorado Department of Education, the Commissioner of Education, and the State Board of Education, has had poor relations and low credibility with the Governor's Office and with the General Assembly. Recent changes, however, including a newly appointed Commissioner, new Board members, and a more aggressive State Department have increased the credibility of these offices and have given them the opportunity to take a more active role in the state educational policy-making process.

The Commissioner of Education

In recent years Colorado has had two Commissioners with greatly contrasting leadership styles. Byron Hansford was Colorado's Commissioner of Education from 1960 through 1971. Respondents characterized Hansford as having been a strong-willed, determined leader. While considered outspoken, he also had the reputation for being a highly able educator. As seen by respondents, Hansford's unfortunate handicap was that he lacked political know-how. As a result, during his long tenure in office, respondents indicated a very poor relationship existed between the state education agency

and general state government. This was indicated from comments by respondents such as:

> (Hansford) had very poor relations with the legislature.
>
> (Hansford) antagonized the legislature.
>
> If there was something (Hansford) wanted (in the legislature), it was almost a foregone conclusion that it would be killed.
>
> (He) really alienated a lot of people, and I guess that hurt the CDE in a lot of ways.

Hansford viewed the Governor's door as being closed to him, and his relationship with the legislature's Joint Budget Committee could probably be described as hostile. While the Colorado Department of Education increased in size under Hansford and branched out to sponsor many useful programs throughout the state, it appears that the state education agency's poor relationship with the Governor and the legislature prohibited the Department from being able to play a major role in the actual process of state educational policy making.

In 1971 Donald Woodington was appointed by the State Board of Education to be Hansford's successor. He brought to the office of the Commissioner a new leadership style. In contrast to his predecessor, Woodington was seen as low-key, management-oriented, and diplomatic.

One of Woodington's first concerns on becoming Commissioner, was to try to improve relations between his office (and the Department) and the Governor and legislature. Part of his effort to achieve this goal went into bringing new personnel into the Department and some first steps in departmental reorganization. Among others, Woodington brought in a new legislative liaison person and a new financial expert to act as an assistant commissioner. Both men, having established reputations within the educational community, increased the credibility of the state Department in the eyes of legislators.

The legislators, having read the negative results of the two recent studies on the state Department discussed previously, were also pleased that Woodington was bent toward a reorganization of the Department.[76]

Woodington himself was a major influence in improving state Department relationships. During our interviews, he was consistently described by legislators as "honest," "accessible," "concerned," "realistic," and "willing to promote change." While Woodington had not been Commissioner long enough for legislators to be entirely definitive, they were generally optimistic about the future relationship between the new Commissioner and the state legislature. This is suggested by the following comments about Woodington which were made by some of the respondents:

> The legislature as a whole has confidence in him.
>
> He is gaining influence.
>
> (Legislators) have a great deal of confidence in Woodington as an administrator and an educator.
>
> The legislature has swung to a more positive attitude toward the SDE. Legislators have a high regard for Woodington as Commissioner and as a person.

Besides influencing improved legislative relations, Woodington also managed to open the door to the Governor's Office. When interviewed, Governor Love stated that Woodington was among his most important sources for advice and ideas on educational matters. Woodington himself felt that the Governor had increasingly called on him concerning important education issues. In fact, the Governor asked for and utilized information and ideas from the Commissioner when he formulated his 1973 State of the State Message.

As Commissioner of Education, Woodington had a good relationship with the increasingly independent-acting State Board of Education. Both he and the four board members interviewed stated that the Board and Commissioner had never had disagreements over major policy decisions. Even so, Woodington

and Board members were quick to emphasize that the Board, commonly termed "rubber stamp" during the Hansford period even by Board members themselves, did more than merely formalize Woodington's policies. As the small, five person board did not divide into committees, Woodington's usual method of working with the Board was to develop a complete proposal for the Board to consider as a whole.

As the new Commissioner of Education, Woodington had attempted to improve the credibility of his office and of the Colorado Department of Education in the eyes of a wary legislature; but the battle between the Colorado General Assembly and the Colorado Department of Education had been long and brutal.

The Colorado Department of Education

As was mentioned before, in the early 1970s the Joint Budget Committee of the General Assembly commissioned two separate studies of the Colorado Department of Education. Unfortunately, neither study painted a good picture of the Department. Both studies reinforced the negative feelings many legislators already held toward the Department.

Besides having to contend with the unpleasant results of these studies, the Department was placed in a financial bind by an unsympathetic legislature. The Joint Budget Committee, retaining tight-fisted control over the State's purse-strings, refused to allocate to the Department anything more than bare minimum funds.[77] The Department, as a result, was relatively low salaried and under-staffed.[78] Many personnel had to be paid from federal funds. As mentioned before, in 1970, 58 per cent of the department's administrative expenditures came from federal sources, a figure higher than found in most states.[79] Both Hansford and Woodington expressed concern about the legislature's reluctance to provide the necessary resources for staffing

even those programs mandated by the legislature.

While the relationship between the legislature and the Colorado Department of Education had been poor for years, our respondents suggested that the Department has been gaining somewhat in credibility with legislators. Also, the Department, through its own initiative, is apparently becoming a more active participant in the policy-making arena. One example of the Department's new participation was seen during the 1973 school finance debate. The Colorado Department of Education, an active member of COED, played an important role in the development and analysis of the coalition's five finance proposals. But, interestingly, the Department also worked closely with the Governor on the development of his proposal. The Department played a significant new role when some of its staff presented the COED plan verbally to the General Assembly. Thus, in addition to acting as a source of advice to both the educational coalition and the Governor, the Department also had direct communication with the legislature.

In the political arena, the ability of the Department to provide accurate, reliable information is an important source of its credibility. When fourteen legislators were asked to name the source of information and advice they found most useful, the Colorado Department of Education was rated second to the CEA. Also, when the legislators were asked to rate the information coming from the Department, ten of the fourteen legislators said the information always or usually met their needs. In addition, the Governor and his staff gave equally positive responses to these same questions.

At the conclusion of an interview, one legislator remarked that success is based upon the confidence held in an agency, and that, because of increased confidence in the Department, its relationship with the legislature was improving.

The Colorado Department of Education has worked closely with the educationa

interest groups through COED since the coalition was formed in 1967. While the Department's relationship with the groups as a whole was quite good, both Commissioners interviewed mentioned that the Department had had continuing disagreements over the years with the CEA over certification and self-governance. Recently, however, some of the tension between the two groups has lessened because the department's new legislative liaison person formerly worked for the CEA.

The State Board of Education

Recent changes in the Colorado State Board of Education have brought an improved relationship between the state education agency and state government. One important change in the Board occurred in 1973 when Republicans were elected to all five seats on the Board. Another change sensed by many Coloradans is a new tendency for both the Board as a whole and for individual members to become more actively involved in educational issues.

In 1968 the Democratic State Board of Education had one Republican member elected to it. Since then, Republicans have gradually replaced Democrats on the Board. While the desirability of a partisan, elected Board of Education versus an appointed board is a debatable issue, in Colorado we found that the party membership of board members definitely affected board relationships, particularly with a Governor and a majority of the legislature being of the same party.

When all board members were Democrats, the Board and the Governor communicated rarely. A number of respondents indicated that the basic reason for this lack of communication was simply the fact that the Governor was Republican while the Board members were Democrats. With the addition of Republicans to the Board, there has been an improved relationship with the Governor. While this recent change of behavior on the part of the Governor

may be due to a number of influences, respondents indicated that Republican Board members traditionally have had greater access to the Governor's office than did their Democratic counterparts.

The present relationship between the State Board of Education and the Governor's office is fairly close. While the Board meets as a whole with the Governor only four or five times each year, individuals do meet informally with the Governor and some of the Governor's staff. The Board members interviewed indicated that the Governor was accessible to the Board, and, in fact, three (of four) board members interviewed said that individual board members are among the Governor's close advisors on educational policy matters. All members interviewed indicated that the Board had worked directly with the Governor and his staff on the development of legislative proposals.

In addition to the party turnover, another change in the State Board is that the Board as a whole and individual members recently have become more active politically. The Board members interviewed generally acknowledged that the Board had functioned as a "rubber stamp" to Hansford, but stated that with the new Commissioner they wanted to shake that description. An impetus toward this new attitude, recal'ed one former board member, had been the realization on the part of some board members that they had been manipulated in the past by some state department staffers and legislators. As a result, these members decided to rely more upon their own resources, which meant also that they had to establish some new relationships and contacts. With the desire both to gather information on their own and to exert influence, some members have recently taken to individually lobbying legislative members. One particular member who was extremely active in the legislature has become widely known and respected by the politicians. The majority of respondents interviewed cited this person by name as being especially influential with legislators. The Board as a whole took a major step toward

more direct political involvement when they presented the Board's platform to the opening session of the 1973 General Assembly.

Increased demands by the electorate have also been influential in encouraging the Board to increase its political know-how. To put it simply, Colorado voters are now demanding that candidates for Board seats be better qualified, more knowledgeable, and more issue-oriented than in the past. One person interviewed recalled that a person running for a state board seat in 1968 simply was not expected to run a campaign on substantive issues. Respondents indicated that now Board members are better qualified and that Board positions are even "hotly contested." Along with increased qualifications, respondents indicated that the prestige of the State Board of Education members has increased substantially in the past few years.

While the Board has had improved relations with the Governor and the General Assembly, the Board's actual influence with these bodies must be examined further. When asked to rate the importance of the State Board of Education as a source of ideas and advice, the Governor rated the Board as a minor source, one of his staff said it was not at all important, and two of his staff said the Board was an important source of advice. A similar division of opinion occurred in the answers to a similar question given to twelve legislators. Five legislators (3R-2D) felt the Board to be one of the most important participants in actually formulating and working for education legislation; five (2R-3D) felt the Board to be of minor importance; and, finally, two legislators (1R-1D) said that the Board was not at all important as a participant.

Most of our respondents who saw the Board as having little or no influence felt that the State Board did little for education in Colorado and definitely was not an important actor in the decision-making process. On the other hand, respondents giving more positive responses appeared to be doing so on a tentative, optimistic basis, sensing that the Board, because

of its recent changes, will be playing a more important policy-making role in the future.

As was noted earlier, the State Board of Education played almost no role in recent school finance, accountability, and desegregation issue areas. During the school finance controversy in November of 1973, the Board, apparently in an effort to stay neutral, refrained from taking a stand either for or against the two important property tax initiative referenda which were on the November 1972 ballot. Also, in the desegregation area, while all of the Board members interviewed indicated that racial-ethnic groups make very frequent bids for the Board's attention, the Board refrained from making any substantive response to these groups.

These examples, plus responses from legislators and the Governor's office, indicate strongly that the State Board has been a minor actor in the educational policy-making process. However, our responses also indicate that a significant percentage of persons in state government would be receptive to a more active policy-making role on the part of the Board.

The Role of the Governor

When John A. Love won his first term as Republican Governor of Colorado in 1962, he was a novice to politics. He learned quickly, however, and by 1973, well into his third term as Governor, his reputation as an astute politician was solidly established. Love's affable personality and his good looks undoubtedly contributed in some measure to his success, but it was his careful leadership style which attracted strong supporters and winning votes.

Love was not an aggressive leader, but sought instead to be in tune with the wishes of the people. A number of respondents said, "He isn't one to be out front on a white charger." He was described by various respondents

as being, "an organizer," "not swayed by emotion," "a thoughtful administrator," and "calculating." One person interviewed said that Love "tries to get others to get ideas together," and that "he tries to get a program we all can live with."

Love's leadership style characterized his recent entry into educational policy making. While Love had expressed an increased interest in education during his years as Governor, the majority of people interviewed felt that his top priorities had been land use control and tax relief. Indeed, the Governor's 1973 State of the State Message was based on these two issues. But, with the close union of property tax relief to school finance reform, education dramatically became Love's top concern in January of 1973.

In his 1973 State of the State Message, the Governor recommended that state aid to schools be increased at a rate of $146 million per calendar year, until such time as there was a new division of fiscal sharing between state and school districts of approximately 60 per cent state and 40 per cent local. The Governor presented a finance formula which would halt the increase in property taxes and even dramatically reduce mill levies. He noted that the formula would meet recent court requirements which stipulated that the quality of education shall not be solely or largely a function of assessed valuation of property in a school district. Moreover, he pointed out that over the years expenditures per pupil would move toward greater equality among school districts.[80] The Governor followed up his message with a school finance bill which he presented to the General Assembly.

In accord with his characteristic leadership style, Love had carefully assessed the mood of the people and of the times before initiating school finance reform. On the heels of recent court cases, the national trend was to search for new means of providing more educational equality. Colorado, as indicated by the fact that legislators and educators were vigorously

drawing up numerous finance proposals, was in the mood for financial reform. Love's school finance proposal, closely aligned with his strong adherence to tax relief measures, was "in tune with the people."

Love's relationship to the Republican-dominated General Assembly was apparently good. Thought of by many as being closer to liberal Democratic viewpoints than those of conservative Republicans, Love often received support from both parties. One of the Governor's staff estimated that 80-90 per cent of the Governor's bills were passed by the legislature each session.

When dealing with the legislature, Love characteristically relied most heavily upon legislative leadership as a source of influence. However, some other approaches he used were: 1) briefing of committees by both his personal and technical staffs, 2) personal contact with members of the legislature, and 3) a close relationship with the press. While the Joint Budget Committee had a tremendous amount of power over the budget and thus could have been an adversary of the Governor, the Governor's staff indicated that the relationship between the Governor and the Committee was a good one.

With the Governor giving school finance his top priority in 1973, his relationship with Commissioner Woodington came into prominence. The fact that the Governor called upon Woodington to advise him about his new finance proposal indicated a dramatically improved relationship between the Governor and Commissioner's office. During our interview with the Governor, he stated that he saw the Commissioner as among his most important sources of ideas and advice concerning education issues. The Governor made an important qualification to that statement when he emphasized that this relationship does not exist simply because of the Commissioner's position, but that "it depends on who fills the job." The Governor felt that part of the reason for the improved relationship was due to the fact that Woodington perceived himself as being a part of the Executive Branch, and, therefore, wanted to be made a part of the executive decision-making process.

Although Love felt a good rapport existed between his office and that of the Commissioner, he indicated that the political strength of the Commissioner was still weak. For instance, when asked if the Commissioner's strong opposition to a bill would greatly diminish its chances of passage, the Governor replied, "No." In the Governor's view, a primary reason for the Commissioner's lack of political strength was due to the fact that testimony by the Commissioner on the basis of expertness just does not have the same effect on educational decision making that strong lobbies do.

The Governor's new interest in educational policy making was enthusiastically received by the education community. One education representative said he was "amazed" at the Governor's proposal, and that he, along with many legislators wanted the Governor's proposal to be retained in part just because they were so pleased that the Governor became involved!

Turning now to the state legislature, we will see that legislators have also become increasingly interested in education. However, the role they have played in educational policy making, as well as the rationale for their activity, differ markedly from those of Governor Love.

The Role of the State Legislature

In contrast to Governor Love's finance proposal which involved increasing state aid to education, the Colorado General Assembly has exhibited a strong desire to hold the schools and the state education agency accountable for the efficient expenditures of funds for education. For example, we have already seen that the legislature was an initiator of the accountability legislation of 1971. And, the legislative decision to commission two studies of State Department of Education operation in the early 1970s also indicated an increased concern for accountability. These and other examples, caused Jerome Murphy to comment in his study of the Colorado Department of Education,

"The legislature, then, was actually engaged in the formulation of state education policy...beyond the normal concern with state aid to schools."[81]

It is likely that the poor relationship which existed between the state education agency and the legislature during the Hansford era stimulated the General Assembly to become more active in education decision making. Because of the lack of communication between the two bodies, the state education agency really could not function as the initiator of education legislation. The General Assembly, therefore, took that role upon itself. The Legislative Interim Committee on Public Education initiated the Accountability Laws of 1971, and, as one respondent put it, came to be "a super board of education." The role played by this legislative committee in the educational policy-making process seems to have greatly surpassed the role played by the State Board of Education itself.

Other legislative committees have played an important part in educational decision making, too. We have already seen that the Interim Committee on State and Local Finance initiated school finance legislation, and that linkage to this committee was critical to those who desired a significant input into the decision-making process. Legislators indicated also that both of the standing education committees initiated education legislation, but that sometimes more was done in the interim committees because of decreased partisan pressures during the summer recess.

While education bills not involving money can go directly from the education committees to the floor, those bills involving money must go to the Appropriations Committee. Most legislators agreed that money bills are the most difficult type of education bills to pass. According to several of our respondents, the Joint Budget Committee, dominated by conservative Republicans, has been a constant headache for educators pleading the cause for increased funding. One legislator claimed that the "low

profile" of the state education agency held by the Joint Budget Committee had greatly influenced the negative attitudes the entire Assembly held toward the agency and educational spending.

As has already been stated, our study revealed that this relationship between the state education agency and the state legislature was improving. With the appointment of Woodington as Commissioner, legislators have turned increasingly to the State Department and Commissioner for information and advice. Generally, the legislators we interviewed had favorable attitudes toward Woodington and optimistic feelings about the increased political involvement of the State Department and the State Board of Education.

The great power held by the General Assembly extends to its relationship with the Governor himself. In contrast to many states, the Colorado legislature has not approved an executive budget system, and, instead, has maintained almost complete control over the annual state budget. Again, this power is primarily in the hands of the Joint Budget Committee. While the executive office prepares a budget yearly and presents it to the legislature, the Joint Budget Committee also goes through the process of preparing a budget and has final authority for budget approval. While the executive office has ardently tried to change this procedure, the Joint Budget Committee, not surprisingly, will not give up its long-established power.

As decision makers, it is important for the legislators to have reliable sources of information and advice. With the Colorado General Assembly's lack of adequate staff and office space, the availability of such information is especially crucial for these legislators. When asked to name the individuals and groups which generally provided the most useful information, the fourteen legislators interviewed mentioned as many as eighteen different sources. The organizations most often mentioned were: the Colorado Education Association, the State Department of Education, and the Colorado Association of School Boards as is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

RESPONSES OF LEGISLATORS TO THE QUESTION OF WHICH INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS GENERALLY PROVIDE THE MOST USEFUL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS (N=14)

	Republican	Democrat	Total
CEA	5	5	10
CDE	4	3	7
CASB	4	2	6
Own school district	2	2	4
Legislative Council	1	2	3
CASE	2	0	2

The legislators were also asked to indicate which education groups are most influential when education and school finance matters are being dealt with by the legislature. Indicating the importance of a group to be considered a reliable source of information, the legislators almost unanimously replied that the CEA and CASB were the most influential education groups. The fact that many legislators failed to mention COED in response to this question most likely results from the fact that it is the individual group representatives which approach legislators rather than representatives of the coalition itself.

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION

In summary, we can conclude that the educational policy-making process in Colorado appears to be in a state of transition. New patterns of communication are in the process of being developed, and new roles are being played by some of the state's educational policy makers. The education coalition (The Council on Educational Development), having earned its credibility, provides stability to the system. It also functions as the focal point for communication among the various policy makers. As stated before, three main themes which have emerged from this study in Colorado are: 1) the unique existence of an enduring and powerful education coalition, 2) the recent involvement of the state education agency in the educational policy-making process and an improved credibility for the agency, and 3) the increased interest expressed by the Governor and the General Assembly in educational issues.

The existence of an enduring education coalition (COED) appears to be unique among the states. The organization, led by a prominent educational leader who is the group's President, is made up of the state's most powerful non-education and education interest groups, and the state education agency. COED's primary topic for concern is school finance, and the organization was very influential in the passage of both 1969 and 1973 school finance legislation.

While the relationships among the COED members has often been strained and difficult, there were no obvious indications at the time of our study that the groups would not remain in the coalition. While studies of educational policy making in some other states indicate that politically aggressive teachers' organizations may pose a threat to education coalitions such as COED, this does not appear to be the case in Colorado. Respondents in our

study indicated that in Colorado the teachers' association (CEA) shared the position of greatest influence and power among education groups with the school boards' association (CASB). It is possible that this state of equalibrium is one of the factors holding the coalition together.

COED plays an extremely important role in Colorado's educational policy-making system by acting as the focal point for communication among the state's policy makers. In many respects, this fact seems to provide a good reason for all of the state's educational policy makers to make an attempt to keep the organization strong and active. For example, we have seen that for many years a deep chasm existed between the state education agency and the Governor and General Assembly. However, when the agency decided to take a more active role upon itself, one entree to the system it had available was through COED (i.e. the State Department worked with COED on the 1973 school finance legislation). We have also seen that when strong philosophical disagreements existed among groups (i.e. CDE and CEA, the Governor and CEA), COED helped keep the channels of communication open.

In general, most respondents indicated that COED members have a sincere desire to provide for a better education system in Colorado. One senses that this positive philosophy overrides, in at least some cases, the competitive stances usually taken by interest groups. A good example of this philosophy occurred when Colorado policy makers worked on the 1973 school finance legislation. For instance, while the Department of Education worked on the COED finance proposal, the Department also worked with the Governor on his plan. Also, while COED had its own finance proposal, its representative also conferred with the Governor on the Governor's plan. It appears that COED's positive philosophy helped to create the atmosphere needed for changes in Colorado's fiscal educational policy.

Our study found that Colorado's state education agency had recently become more involved in the policy-making process than it had been in the past. The new Commissioner, Donald Woodington, had begun to establish improved communication with the Governor and the General Assembly. He had also begun the departmental reorganization which had been strongly encouraged by the legislature. The Department itself seemed to be improving its credibility as a reliable and accurate information source to the various policy makers. Finally, the State Board of Education, long reputed to be a "rubber stamp" for the state's former Commissioner, appeared to be becoming more active and independent. All of these tendencies suggest that Colorado's state education agency could be on the verge of becoming a much more important actor in the education policy-making process than it had been previously.

Shortly after our research ended in Colorado, however, Woodington resigned from his position of Commissioner. Although he considered many factors before resigning, one of his reasons for leaving appeared to be the fact that the State Board would not give him a contract, but, instead, chose to appoint him on a day to day basis. An obvious factor here is that while this stance by the Board allows it to fire the Commissioner at will, it also gives the Commissioner the freedom to resign, as Woodington did.

What effect Woodington's resignation will have on Colorado's policy-making process is impossible to predict. Our study did indicate that Coloradans tended to react to Commissioners of Education more on the basis of style and personality than in terms of their position. Therefore, it seems likely that the new Commissioner Calvin M. Frazier, will have to re-establish relationships and that people will react to him and evaluate him on the basis of his ability and style.

Another change which would make future predictions for Colorado difficult, was the recent resignation of Governor Love. The former Republican

governor was appointed by President Nixon in the summer of 1973 to the national post of "Energy Czar," however, in December 1973, he was removed from his post. To review briefly, Love, Governor of Colorado for eleven years, was not viewed by respondents as having been an education-oriented Governor. His major concerns were seen as being land use and tax relief. In 1973, however, the combination of a large state surplus of funds and the Governor's desire to provide tax relief caused him to be a major proponent of school finance reform. The Governor's new interest was received enthusiastically by the education community; and much of the Governor's proposal was included in the 1973 School Finance Act.

The Colorado General Assembly has also shown an increased interest in education in recent years. The legislature has, in fact, increasingly taken upon itself the role of initiator of education legislation. This powerful legislative role was due to a number of factors. One factor was that the state legislators in general were dissatisfied with the state education agency. Another factor was an increased concern on the part of legislators and the public with rapidly rising educational costs which were not, in their opinion, coupled with increased educational outputs. These factors were involved in the legislature's initiation and passage of Colorado's 1971 Accountability Laws.

The General Assembly's Joint Budget Committee has historically had very poor relations with the state education agency, and in the early 1970s, the Committee hired two outside consultant firms to conduct studies of the State Department of Education. Both studies indicated that the Department had had little impact on Colorado's educational system. However, at the time of our study the General Assembly appeared to be reacting more favorably toward the state education agency.

In conclusion, the fact that Colorado's educational policy-making process appears to be in a state of transition must be reiterated. Because of the recent resignations of both the Commissioner of Education and the Governor, predicting the future, at best difficult, is now impossible. With the two major resignations, the General Assembly and COED stand out even more significantly as the stable forces in the educational policy-making process in Colorado.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Neal R. Peirce, The Mountain States of America (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1972) p. 34.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

[3] Ibid., p. 47.

[4] Ibid., p. 58.

[5] Colorado Trumpet (Volume 37, no. 11, 1972) p. 1.

[6] "Report of: Committee on Fiscal Policy," Colorado Legislative Council (No. 144, January 1969) p. 5.

[7] Ibid., p. 5.

[8] Education in the States: Historical Development and Outlook (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1969) p. 147.

[9] Jerome T. Murphy, "Grease the Squeaky Wheel" (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard, 1973) p. 373.

[10] The Denver Post, Sunday, October 15, p. 2.

[11] Ibid., p. 2.

[12] Ibid., p. 2.

[13] Interview, January 30, 1973.

[14] Joseph A. Schlessinger, "The Politics of the Executive," in Politics in the American States, H. Jacob and K. Vines, eds., Little Brown and Co., Boston, 1971, (Table 10).

[15] Ibid., Table 7.

[16] The Constitution of the State of Colorado (Denver: B. Anderson, Secretary of State) Article IX, Section 2, p. 40.

[17] Ibid., Article IX, Section 1, p. 39.

[18] Sam P. Harris, State Departments of Education, State Boards of Education, and Chief State School Officers. DHEW Publication No. (OE) 73-07400 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973).

[19] Colorado School Laws 1971 (Denver: Colorado Department of Education, 1971) p. 334.

[20] Schools, People and Money, The President's Commission on School Finance, (Washington D.C., 1972) p. 123.

[21] The Constitution of the State of Colorado, op. cit., Article IX, Section 1, p. 40.

[22]Colorado School Laws 1971, op. cit., p. 336.

[23]Ibid., p. 337.

[24]Education Colorado, Volume VIII, No. 9, May 1973, p. 1.

[25]Colorado School Laws 1971, op. cit., p. 333.

[26]Ibid., p. 337.

[27]"Synopsis Colorado Department of Education Budget Request 1973-1974," Colorado Department of Education, January 1973, p. 1.

[28]The Federal-State Partnership for Education (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970) p. 14.

[29]Murphy, Jerome T., op. cit., p. 374.

[30]Measures of Ability, Effort, and Expenditures with Regard to State School Finance (from National Education Association, Ranking of the States, 1972, (Washington D.C., Research Division, NEA, 1972) p. 36.

[31]Ibid., p. 50.

[32]Relative Contribution of State, Local, and Federal Government to Revenues for Public Schools (from National Education Association, Rankings of the States, 1972, Washington, D.C., Research Division, NEA 1972) p. 51.

[33]Ibid., p. 50.

[34]Ibid., p. 52.

[35]Trends in State Finance 1946-1971 (Colorado Legislative Council, No. 184, Part III, July 1972) p.p. 5-6.

[36]Governor Love, "1973 State of the State Message," p. 3.

[37]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[38]Measures of "Ability," "Effort" and "Expenditures" with regard to State School Finance, op. cit., p. 49.

[39]Johns, Thomas L. and Foerster, Janet (Eds.), Public School Finance Programs, 1971-72 (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare) p. 2.

[40]"Questions and Answers about School District Budgeting," (Colorado Education Association, Department of Research, 1972) p. 8.

[41]Ibid., p. 9.

[42]See Table III in "An Analysis of Colorado's School Finance Plan and Some Alternatives for Consideration," Council on Education Development, August 7, 1972.

[43] Education Colorado, VI, No. 15 (May 18, 1971) p. 1.

[44] "State and Local Finance Recommendations for 1973," Colorado Legislative Council, No. 187, December, 1972, p. 13-14.

[45] Woodington, Donald, "Accountability from the Viewpoint of a State Commissioner of Education," from Phi Delta Kappan, October, 1972, p. 95.

[46] "Exerpts of the Report of the Committee on Public Education," (Denver: Legislative Council, 1970) p. 17.

[47] Burns, Leonard T., Problems and Needs in Implementing Accountability Legislation in Colorado (University of Colorado, 1972) p. 8.

[48] Ibid., p. 8.

[49] Ibid., p. 9.

[50] Fry Consultants, A Study of the Colorado Department of Education (Colorado General Assembiy Joint Budget Committee, 1972).

[51] Strengthening Educational Management in Colorado, Volume I: A Summary Report of the Joint Budget Committee to the Colorado General Assembly, February, 1971.

[52] Branscombe, Art, "Educational Accountability Law to Help Colorado Taxpayers Get Money's Worth," (Denver: Denver Post, Sunday, October 3).

[53] Education Colorado (Colorado Department of Education, Vol. V, No. 1, September 9, 1969) p. 6.

[54] "Exerpts of the Report of the Committee on Public Education," op. cit., p. 9.

[55] Coon, E. Dean, "New Laws--if Schools Can Make them Work--Will Give Public More for his Education Dollar," in Education Colorado (Vol. VII, No. 1, September 4, 1971) p. 4.

[56] The Constitution of the State of Colorado, op. cit., Article IX, Section 1, p. 39.

[57] Report on the Educational Accountability Act of 1971, Colorado Department of Education, 1972.

[58] "Cooperative Accountability Project," the Colorado Department of Education, September 1972.

[59] "The Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Colorado Public Schools," (Denver: The Colorado Department of Education, 1971) p.p. 8-16.

[60] The Colorado Constitution, op. cit., p.p. 40-41.

[61] Education Colorado, op. cit., May 20, 1969, p. 2.

[62] Hazard, William, Education and the Law (New York: The Free Press, 1971) p. 38.

[63]"Toward Equality of Educational Opportunity in Colorado," The Colorado Department of Education, October, 1972.

[64]Ibid.

[65]"The Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Colorado Public Schools," op. cit., p. 8. See Footnote 57.

[66]Adopted by the Colorado State Board of Education on May 14, 1968.

[67]The Denver Post, Thursday, October 12, 1972, p. 2.

[68]The New York Times, Sunday, June 24, 1973, p. 36.

[69]Shannon, Thomas A., "The Denver Decision: Death Knell for De Facto Segregation?", in Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. LV, No. 1, September 1973, p. 6.

[70]Ibid., p. 7.

[71]The New York Times, Sunday, June 24, 1973, p. 36.

[72]"The Distribution of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Colorado Public Schools," op. cit., p.p. 8-9. See Footnote 57.

[73]Ibid., p. 8.

[74]"The Council on Educational Development," Untitled paper, 1972.

[75]Ibid.

[76]"The Fry Report," and "The Stanford Research Institute Report," op. cit., See footnotes 48 and 49.

[77]Murphy, Jerome T., op. cit., p. 372.

[78]Ibid., p. 373.

[79]Ibid., p. 374.

[80]John A. Love, "State of the State Message," op. cit.

[81]Murphy, Jerome T., op. cit., p. 373.